

AGENDA
SOCIETY OF PROFESSIONAL JOURNALISTS
BOARD OF DIRECTORS MEETING
TIME: 9:00A.M.
APRIL 20, 2013
INDIANAPOLIS

1. Call to Order – *Albarado*
2. Roll Call – *Neuts*
 - a. Albarado
 - b. Cuillier
 - c. Neuts
 - d. Ralston
 - e. Ensslin
 - f. McCloskey
 - g. Corry
 - h. Wagner
 - i. Kenney
 - j. Fox
 - k. Daniels
 - l. Baker
 - m. Eckert
 - n. Koretzky
 - o. Gallagher-Newberry
 - p. Stevens
 - q. Theisen
 - r. Sheets
 - s. Gallagher
 - t. Meyers
 - u. Marquand
 - v. Carnicelli
 - w. Hernandez
3. Report of the SPJ President – *Albarado*
4. Approval of Board Meeting Minutes – *Albarado*
 - a. Oct. 23, 2012 [**Page 2**]
 - b. Sept. 23, 2012 [**Page 3**]
 - c. Sept. 20, 2012 [**Page 7**]
5. Review and adoption of the SPJ budget for the fiscal year ending July 31, 2014. – *Skeel* [**Page 11**]
6. Chapter Activity – *Puckey* [**Page 30**]
7. Staff Report – *Skeel* [**Page 31**]
8. EIJ updates – *Skeel*
 - a. 2013 – Anaheim, Calif., Aug. 24-26.
 - b. 2014 – Nashville Opryland, Sept. 4-6
 - c. 2015 – TBA
 - d. 2016 – New Orleans Sheraton, Sept. 18-20 (proposed) [**Page 34**]
9. Nominations Report – *Ensslin*
10. Action/Discussion Items
 - a. Regional Fund Oversight – *Neuts* [**Page 35**]
 - b. LDF requests – *Albarado*
 - i. The Daily Helmsman (University of Memphis)
 - ii. Paul Bass (New Haven Independent)
 - iii. Daily Reveille (Louisiana State University)
 - c. LDF limit – *Albarado* [**Page 36**]
 - d. Social Media Guidelines – *Albarado* [**Page 39**]

- e. Chapter Transparency – *Cuillier* [**Page 42**]
 - f. Scripps Leadership Institute update – *Puckey*
 - g. Fair Use principles – *Skeel* [**Page 47**]
11. Report of the SDX Foundation President – *Leger*
12. Old/New Business
13. Committee Reports
- a. ACEJMC – *Geimann* [**Page 71**]
 - b. Awards and Honors – *Kopen Katcef* [**Page 75**]
 - c. Communications – *Bartlett* [**Page 76**]
 - d. Diversity – *Gonzalez* [**Page 78**]
 - e. Ethics – *Smith* [**Page 81**]
 - f. Journalism Education – *Tallent* [**Page 83**]
 - g. Freedom of Information – *Peterson* [**Page 84**]
 - h. Freelance – *Fitzgerald* [**Page 86**]
 - i. Generation J – *Walsh* [**Page 88**]
 - j. LDF – *Limor* [**Page 36**]
 - k. Professional Development – *Wenger* [**Page 91**]
14. Adjournment

THE SOCIETY OF PROFESSIONAL JOURNALISTS

BOARD OF DIRECTORS MEETING

**APRIL 20, 2012
9 A.M. – 5 P.M.**

INDIANAPOLIS



IMPROVING AND PROTECTING JOURNALISM SINCE 1909

THE SOCIETY OF PROFESSIONAL JOURNALISTS IS THE NATION'S LARGEST AND MOST BROAD-BASED JOURNALISM ORGANIZATION, DEDICATED TO ENCOURAGING THE FREE PRACTICE OF JOURNALISM AND STIMULATING HIGH STANDARDS OF ETHICAL BEHAVIOR.

FOUNDED IN 1909 AS SIGMA DELTA CHI, SPJ PROMOTES THE FREE FLOW OF INFORMATION VITAL TO A WELL-INFORMED CITIZENRY, WORKS TO INSPIRE AND EDUCATE THE NEXT GENERATION OF JOURNALISTS, AND PROTECTS FIRST AMENDMENT GUARANTEES OF FREEDOM OF SPEECH AND PRESS.

**MINUTES
MEETING OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS
SOCIETY OF PROFESSIONAL JOURNALISTS
OCTOBER 23, 2012
CONFERENCE CALL**

MEETING CALLED TO ORDER

With President Sonny Albarado presiding, the meeting of the board of directors of the Society of Professional Journalists was called to order at 1:04 p.m. EST on Tuesday, October 23, 2012, via conference call.

In addition to Albarado, the following were present: President-Elect David Cuillier; Secretary-Treasurer Dana Neuts; Vice President for Campus Chapter Affairs Neil Ralston; Directors -at-Large Bill McCloskey and Carl Corry; Campus Advisers at-Large Kym Fox and George Daniels; Student Representative Mary Kenney; Regional Directors Rebecca Baker, Michael Koretzky, Sue Stevens, Amanda Theisen Eddy Gallagher, Don Meyers, Ian Marquand and Tony Hernandez. Staff members present for the meeting were Executive Director Joe Skeel and Associate Executive Director Chris Vachon.

PARTNERSHIP WITH NAHJ REGARDING EXCELLENCE IN JOURNALISM 2013

Executive Director Skeel explained that the president of NAHJ (National Association of Hispanic Journalists) approached RTDNA about the possibility of NAHJ joining SPJ and RTDNA in Anaheim, Calif. for the Excellence in Journalism 2013 conference (EIJ13).

After discussions with SPJ president Albarado, Skeel, in partnership with the RTDNA executive director, prepared a proposal for NAHJ's board to review.

On October 19, 2012, NAHJ's board voted to accept the EIJ13 proposal. On October 22, 2012, RTDNA's board voted to allow NAHJ to join EIJ13.

The board had the opportunity to review the proposal prior to the call and the proposal answered most questions. Questions from the SPJ board were mainly directed to staff with inquiries such as space at the hotel and the ability of NAHJ to carry their financial responsibilities. In addition, the board inquired about the branding and identity of EIJ and of each organization.

After a Call to Question motion from Koretzky and a second by Myers, and upon proper motion and second by McCloskey and Baker, respectively, the board voted to authorize the staff to negotiate a contract between EIJ and NAHJ and for that contract to be brought back before the SPJ board.

ADJOURNMENT

Upon proper motion and second by Daniels and Stevens, respectively, the board adjourned at 1:31 p.m. EST on October 23, 2012.

MINUTES
MEETING OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS
SOCIETY OF PROFESSIONAL JOURNALISTS
SEPTEMBER 23, 2012
FORT LAUDERDALE, FLA.

MEETING CALLED TO ORDER

With President Sonny Albarado presiding, the meeting of the board of directors of the Society of Professional Journalists was called to order at 9:09 a.m. on Sunday, September 23, 2012, at the Marriott Harbor Beach, in conjunction with the Society's annual convention at the Excellence in Journalism conference.

In addition to Albarado, the following were present: President-Elect David Cuillier; Immediate Past President John Ensslin; Secretary-Treasurer Dana Neuts; Vice President for Campus Chapter Affairs Neil Ralston; Director at-Large Bill McCloskey; Director at-Large Carl Corry, Campus Adviser at-Large Kym Fox; Student Representatives Mary Kenney and Meg Wagner; Regional Directors Rebecca Baker, Brian Eckert, Michael Koretzky, Patricia Gallagher Newberry, Sue Stevens, Amanda Theisen, David Sheets, Eddy Gallagher, Don Meyers and Terri Carnicelli.

Staff members present for the meeting were Executive Director Joe Skeel, Director of Events Heather Dunn and Chapter Coordinator Tara Puckey.

WELCOME AND INTRODUCTION

President Albarado welcomed new board members to the meeting.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE ELECTIONS

Upon proper motion and second by Neuts and Meyers, respectively, the board elected Brian Eckert to the SPJ Executive Committee as a representative of the Regional Director caucus.

Upon proper motion and second by Eckert and Ensslin, respectively, the board elected Bill McCloskey to the SPJ Executive Committee as an at-large member.

APPOINTMENTS TO SIGMA DELTA CHI FOUNDATION BOARD

Albarado appointed the members of SPJ's executive committee to the SDX Foundation board: Albarado, Ensslin, Cuillier, Neuts, Ralston, McCloskey and Eckart.

RATIFICATION OF THE SDX FOUNDATION BOARD ELECTIONS

Albarado read the new offices elected to the Sigma Delta Chi Foundation. Robert Leger became president, Irwin Gratz was elected Vice President and Jane Kirtley was elected as Secretary.

Upon proper motion and second by Eckert and McCloskey, respectively, the board ratified the new elections to the SDX Foundation board.

COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSONS

Albarado read a list of committees and their chair persons. Sue Kopen Katcef is the new chairperson of the Awards Committee and Michael Fitzgerald is the new chairperson of the Freelance Committee. All other committee chairs stayed the same. Albarado said he removed the Government Relations committee from the list of SPJ Committees.

FINANCE COMMITTEE APPOINTMENTS

Upon proper motion and second by Koretzky and Meyers, respectively, the board approved the nominations of Bill McCloskey and Brian Eckert to serve on the SPJ Finance Committee.

DIVERSITY LEADERSHIP FELLOWS

Rebecca Aguilar, Diversity Committee member, introduced the 2012 Diversity Leadership Fellows. Each gave a brief background and the goals of their involvement. Fellows in attendance were Malik Singleton, Britney Tabor and Tony Hernandez. The Fellows not able to attend the meeting were Nigel Duara, Sandra Gonzalez and Sherri Williams.

REGIONAL DIRECTOR APPOINTMENTS

Dana Neuts brought up the fact that the Region 10 Director position was vacant since she had been elected to the Secretary-Treasurer position during the closing business session the day prior. She recommended Ian Marquand for the position.

Albarado brought up that Kelly Kissel had recently stepped down as Region 12 Director due to new job responsibilities and recommended Tony Hernandez to be the new Region 12 Director.

Upon proper motion and second by Koretzky and McCloskey, respectively, the board approved the nominations of Ian Marquand (Region 10) and Tony Hernandez (Region 12) as new Regional Directors on the national board.

THANKS TO ENSSLIN

Michael Koretzky thanked John Ensslin for his presidency and Ensslin was presented with a crystal baseball and gift card to the Apple Store for her service.

SOCIAL MEDIA POLICY

A discussion on SPJ's social media policy took place based on a recent issue with the Red & Black newspaper response. Koretzky recapped the issue and the RD discussion that happened prior to the board of directors meeting. Ensslin and Carnicelli spoke about the issue as well. Albarado said that he was not expecting a resolution during the meeting and had appointed a committee to looking into the social media policy issue. The regional director caucus asked that David Sheets be added to the committee and Dana Neuts also offered her service to the committee.

FINANCIAL MATTERS

Albarado recognized Bill Bleyer from the Press Club of Long Island to speak from the gallery. Bleyer expanded on the financial issues that had taken place in his chapter earlier in the year and about the resolution that had been presented at the previous day's closing business session. He asked for a committee to be created to examine the issue of transparency with local chapter

finances. Sue Stevens said transparency should go beyond just financials and extend to chapter meeting minutes. Teri Carnicelli mentioned how she presents financial reports as treasurer of her chapter. Albarado asked Carl Corry & Bill Bleyer to draft a recommendation of how they'd like to see chapter financial oversight done.

COMMITTEE CONFERENCE REGISTRATIONS

The next point of new business was brought up by Don Meyers. He explained that it's hard for SPJ committee chairs to attend the conference because they have no financial backing from the organization. He recommended that each committee, having a meeting at the convention, be given one complimentary conference registration. It would cover the registration fee only. The committee chair (or designee) would still be responsible for all of their travel and other costs. There was discussion from board members on both sides of the issue. Skeel brought up that comp registrations impact the bottom line of the conference and we need to be aware of that since it also impacts our partner, RTDNA. After more discussion, Koretzky called the question and it was seconded by Carnicelli.

The motion that moved on to a vote is: All committees formally meeting at the convention will be given one complimentary registration for the committee chair, or a designee. The program has a one year sunset and will be reevaluated at the August 25, 2013 meeting in Anaheim.

A voice vote was taken and the motion passed by a vote of 12 (yes) to 5 (no).

RECLASSIFYING CHAPTER SIZE FOR AWARDS PURPOSES

Brian Eckert made a motion that dealt with how SPJ classifies chapters by size for the purpose of chapter awards. "For the purpose of classifying chapters by size for awards, it should be based on the chapter's specific bylaws pertaining to what qualifies someone as a member." The motion was seconded by Koretzky. Eckert then moved to table the discussion until the spring and it was seconded by Stevens.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE BUSINESS

Koretzky said that he'd like to be provided with information on the overall power of the executive committee at the April 2013 board meeting in Indianapolis.

The last item discussed was from Teri Carnicelli. She said she'd like the board to be provided with information on the executive director's evaluation pertaining to the goals set forth by the executive director and the executive committee as this will give the board an overall idea of what the executive director is being asked to do on behalf of the Society.

BOARD ORIENTATION AND LEGAL UPDATE

Laurie Babinski reviewed the requirements for board members and their legal and fiduciary responsibilities. She also presented the annual report from Baker Hostetler as a handout to the board. A formal oral presentation of the legal update was not given.

CLOSING

Albarado thanked the staff and volunteers for their work on the conference and said that he's excited for what he term holds as president of SPJ.

ADJOURNMENT

Upon proper motion and second by Theisen and Ensslin, respectively, the meeting was adjourned at 10:59 a.m.

DRAFT

MINUTES
MEETING OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS
SOCIETY OF PROFESSIONAL JOURNALISTS
SEPTEMBER 20, 2012
FORT LAUDERDALE, FL

MEETING CALLED TO ORDER

With President John Ensslin presiding, the meeting of the board of directors of the Society of Professional Journalists was called to order at 9:14 a.m. on Thursday, September 20, 2012, at the Marriott Harbor Beach, in conjunction with the Society's annual convention at the Excellence in Journalism conference.

In addition to Ensslin, the following were present: Immediate Past President Hagit Limor; President-Elect Sonny Albarado; Secretary-Treasurer David Cuillier; Vice President for Campus Chapter Affairs Neil Ralston; Director at-Large Bill McCloskey; Director at-Large Lauren Bartlett, Campus Adviser at-Large Kym Fox; Student Representatives Gideon Grudo and Taylor Mirfendereski; Regional Directors Luther Turmelle, Brian Eckert, Michael Koretzky, Liz Hansen, Amanda Theisen, Kelsey Volkman, Eddy Gallagher, Don Meyers, Dana Neuts and Teri Carnicelli.

Staff members present for the meeting were Executive Director Joe Skeel and Chapter Coordinator Tara Puckey.

PRESIDENT'S REPORT

President Ensslin began his report by introducing the idea of a partnership with National Press Photographers Association. Because of the high number of arrests of journalists in recent months, especially photojournalists, Ensslin proposed a joint project on World Press Freedom Day. In addition, NPPA and SPJ will write a letter to NYC Police Commissioner Ray Kelly recommending that he use NPPA's attorney to lead a training session for command staff. Ensslin heard no opposition and plans to move forward with the projects.

Ensslin also spoke briefly about his visit to DePauw University, the birthplace of the Society, where he inducted 10 new members into the newly revived chapter. Ironically, Sigma Delta Chi was founded by just 10 members at the very same location. Ensslin added that the original chapter seems to be off to a good start and is taking shape again.

APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES

Upon proper motion and second by Limor and Bartlett, respectively, the board approved meeting minutes from the April 28, 2012 and June 16, 2012 meetings.

The following edits were requested:

- April 28, 2012: Carcinelli requested changes to Campus Chapter Requirement wording, to reflect the final decision of the board at that meeting. *"Schools seeking a charter will have one confirmed faculty adviser who teaches or works in the field of journalism..."*

SIGMA DELTA CHI FOUNDATION REPORT

Steve Geimann submitted his report on behalf of the Sigma Delta Chi Foundation.

Limor asked the board to thank Geimann for his hard work and dedication to the Society and Sigma Delta Chi as he steps down from six years as president of the Foundation.

CHAPTER ACTION

Upon proper motion and second by Eckert and Meyers, respectively, the board approved a charter for High Point University in North Carolina.

STAFF REPORT

Skeel delivered the report of the executive director and reported that in the most recent fiscal year SPJ's revenue exceeded the budget by \$157,000. However, expenses were also more than expected and totaled roughly \$93,000 over budget. Overall, Skeel concluded that the Society made more than it spent.

Associate Executive Director Chris Vachon spoke briefly about the convention, reporting that attendance numbers are around 1,000 and that roughly 60 percent of attendees are members of the Society. She also cited several reasons numbers are low in comparison to Excellence in Journalism 2011: UNITY took place this year, it is an election year, the partnership with RTDNA is no longer "new," Online News Association is holding their convention at the same time in San Francisco.

Turmelle asked Skeel about billing members in increments. Skeel explained that the database upgrade is in full swing and should be available within a few weeks. The upgrade, however, does not include billing in increments, although Skeel noted that it is feasible. McCloskey asked for further discussion.

Skeel expressed a concern for the cost of incremental billing, noting that the Society would be taking a fiscal risk to implement this feature. Turmelle reported he felt members need the feature to make expenses more manageable, while Neuts said the cost would be returned to the Society in the end. Cuillier urged Skeel to move forward.

McCloskey made a motion that Skeel "install whatever it's called," referring to the ability of members to pay dues in installments. The motion was seconded by Neuts.

Further discussion directed that the installment billing feature should be implemented by the end of the year, pending any technical glitches. Ralston made a point to say that in communication, the Society should be up front about fees or additional charges that members may be required to pay to take advantage of installment billing.

DISCUSSION ITEMS

REGIONAL FUND OVERSIGHT

Albarado reported that he asked Eckert to poll other RDs about their regional finances and inquire about sending HQ a yearly report. Eckert said that he found regional funds are handled in a variety of ways and it would be difficult to find a solution to meet all needs. Discussion

followed to include concerns about: the need for additional reports, locating missing bank accounts when passed through multiple RDs, emails and reports can be fabricated, who actually retains control of regional funds.

Suggestions included a committee formed to talk about best practices (report and presentation were already created and are available on the SPJ website), adding second signers on the account and asking chapter leaders to access online regional accounts. Hagit suggested the Secretary-Treasurer help develop oversight of regional funds and help guide RDs to ensure best practices.

Upon proper motion and second by Theisen and Gallagher, respectively, the board that the Secretary-Treasurer work with RDs to develop oversight of regional funds. Eckert opposed.

INTERNATIONAL MEMBERSHIPS

A quick discussion and overview of the policy was given by Skeel and Puckey.

Upon proper motion by McCloskey and Meyers, respectively, the board voted to adopt the policy as SPJ's international policy.

INSTITUTIONAL MEMBERSHIPS

Neuts expressed concern that the proposed membership discount is 33 percent, which she believed was too high. Ensslin thought that the levels should be renamed Bronze, Silver and Gold, and also expressed concern about the membership discount, saying he thought \$60 was a better number. Ensslin urged Staff to reevaluate policies for the Collegiate Institutional Memberships.

Upon proper motion and second by Bartlett and Carnicelli, respectively, the board voted to approve the adoption of Institutional Memberships at the levels of Bronze, Silver and Gold to include a \$60 discounted membership rather than \$75 and to put a cap at 10 Gold Memberships for the first year and to give Staff the ability to make changes without board approval.

TED SCRIPPS LEADERSHIP PROGRAM

Bartlett explained her concern that the movement of the program would only give chapter leaders the opportunity to participate every four years, which could likely be problematic for chapters with a high rate of turnover in leadership. Limor talked about the ultimate goal of reaching more leaders and her belief that the new proposal will be able to achieve that goal.

Upon proper motion and second by Meyers and Fox, respectively, the board voted to direct Staff to proceed with the plan for Scripps Leadership Program as outlined by Staff and return with a progress report at the next national convention. Bartlett opposed.

FAIR USE PROJECT

Skeel spoke briefly about the Fair Use Project being created at American University. A report included in the board materials explained that the project was at the halfway mark and that Columbia Journalism Review recently showcased the effort.

PARTNERSHIP WITH NPPA

Ensslin talked again about his ideas for a partnership with NPPA and was met with some concern that students would not be in session during the time of the World Press Freedom Day project. Ralston remarked that we see press freedom issues too frequently and expressed his desire to push a lawsuit forward at some point, making an example of an important case. Limor commented on the amount of funds in the Legal Defense Fund, adding that she wonders if we should be more offensive as opposed to defensive.

OLD/NEW BUSINESS

ELECTION PROCESS UPDATE

Steele and Puckey spoke briefly about the process, addressing various points to include: ways Staff has tried to connect with members, process for filling out a paper ballot, report of 27 paper ballots returned to HQ and a negative response to email correspondence with members regarding the election. Puckey said unsubscribe rates were high and several members complained. The Election Communication Committee will explore other options moving forward.

EIJ REGISTRATIONS FOR COMMITTEES

Meyers proposed giving one free conference registration for each committee chair or a designated member of the committee, not to exceed one per committee. He expressed that it would be a good way to reward chairs for their hard work and bring them to convention where they continue to do work on behalf of the Society.

Steele questioned the number of committees that work exclusively at convention, as well as smaller committees. Neuts inquired about the cost of a proposal such as this and wondered if this would only reward committee chairs who already planned on attending the conference.

Turmelle seconded the motion, but both Meyers and Turmelle withdrew their motion and second, respectively, with the intention the proposal be discussed at the meeting on Saturday, Sept. 22, 2012.

CLASSIFYING THE SIZE OF CHAPTERS

Eckert proposed that for the purpose of classifying chapters by size for awards, only chapter dues paying members of record on Oct. 1 of the year in question should be counted. Bartlett seconded the motion.

Steele provided information that not all chapters charge dues and the limitations of our database. Both Eckert and Bartlett withdrew their motion and second, respectively, so that the issue could be discussed further during the meeting on Saturday, Sept. 22, 2012.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Upon proper motion and second by Theisen and Ralston, respectively, the board entered executive session to discuss the Executive Director's evaluation.

The board exited executive session and adjourned at 12:35 p.m. Sept. 20, 2012.



MEMORANDUM

DATE: April 5, 2013
FROM: Joe Skeel, Executive Director
SUBJ: Proposed SPJ Budget for Fiscal Year 2014
FOR: SPJ Board of Directors; SPJ Finance Committee

THE NATIONAL
JOURNALISM CENTER

3909 N. MERIDIAN ST.

INDIANAPOLIS, IND. 46208

317-927-8000

FAX: 317-920-4789

SPJ@SPJ.ORG

WWW.SPJ.ORG

Included with this cover memorandum is the staff’s proposed budget for SPJ for the fiscal year ending July 31, 2014. A number of supporting documents are included to provide a better understanding into the process of constructing the budget.

As you review this information, please remember that this is a management tool, albeit a most important one. The numbers presented represent staff’s “best guess” based on fixed expenses, estimates, historical data and possible trends.

In years past, I presented an ultra-conservative budget. I felt this was necessary to restock our depleted reserves. Although we haven’t reached my goal of \$500,000 (stocked away in investments), we are in a position to weather a heavy storm should one arise.

Furthermore, we can afford to be a bit more aggressive with our programs and services (such as conducting more Saturday workshops, beefing up Quill’s online presence, marketing SPJ at other journalism conferences and adding hours for Jake to help with our association management).

Therefore, this budget is less conservative than years past. Although a few figures are slightly scaled back from what we actually project (membership and awards for example), the majority are what we expect. If we hit our budget, great. If we miss it by just a bit, it won’t kill us.

The one giant variable in all of this is Excellence in Journalism. To be safe, we based our EIJ revenue off of our EIJ13 conference, which was significantly lower than EIJ12. Deep down, I believe we will rebound. But I’m not prepared to tie our financial outlook to my gut.

This conservative EIJ approach is the main reason we aren’t projecting an increase in revenue over last year’s budget.

BUDGET PROCESS

Each staffer prepared the preliminary budget for his or her department. Several meetings were held over the course of several weeks to identify any potential gaps. I oversaw the process to make sure staffers could defend their assumptions and to make sure all of the numbers tied out in the end.

REVENUE HIGHLIGHTS

GRANT REVENUE FROM THE SDX FOUNDATION

For Fiscal Year 2014, the following grant requests have been submitted to the Foundation. They have been approved by the Foundation Grants Committee and await final approval from the Foundation board of directors.

Training Place	\$187,722
National Convention Education	\$85,000
Mark of Excellence Program Support	\$27,201
2013 Chapter Programming Grants	\$7,660
Diversity Leadership	\$7,570
TOTAL	\$315,153

This budget assumes the Foundation board will accept the committee’s recommendation and fund the \$315,153. We received about \$307,500 last year.

OTHER CONTRIBUTIONS/GRANT REVENUE

Included in the budget is a projected grant from Scripps Howard Foundation in the amount of \$50,000 to fund the Ted Scripps Leadership Training Institute.

Also, we are projecting less in EIJ sponsorship, which is included in this line item.

MEMBERSHIP

Our membership continues to hold relatively steady, but we are lagging behind just slightly over the prior year. I’m not concerned about it, but did budget a bit more conservatively in this category. We are budgeting for a 2.5 percent decline in membership.

AWARDS

With four years under our belt, we now have a better idea of the impact our online awards system (and increase in categories) has on the budget. Because we expect a similar economy moving forward, we are budgeting for a similar performance in FY2014. These figures represent 96 percent of actual awards revenue from the current fiscal year. Last year, we only budgeted for 90 percent of our projection – and reached 100 percent.

REGISTRATION FEES

We are projecting significantly less than the prior year. Again, this is because we are basing our budget on EIJ13 actuals. Although NAHJ is coming on board this year, the agreement states they retain 100 percent of their members’ registration fees.

ROYALTIES

For the past two years, I have not included payments we receive from our third-party job bank. Because we don’t have many SPJ jobs posted, I have been waiting for the day that they cut us loose. Yet, because we are lumped in with several other small businesses, we continue to receive significant revenue from them. I finally feel comfortable including the revenue – namely because it won’t kill us if it falls off the table.

ASSOCIATION MANAGEMENT

RTDNA approached us in 2012, and we now manage its bookkeeping. This is in addition to NAHJ. I am not budgeting for growth in this area. But, I plan to spend a considerable amount of time in this area in the coming year. Frankly, I think it has the most growth potential off all our revenue sources. And I plan to devote a significant amount of time to drumming up businesses.

SDX FOUNDATION MANAGEMENT

This is projected reimbursement of SDX's expenses that SPJ pays upfront (salaries, utilities, maintenance, etc., etc.). The increase is mainly due to an increase in salaries.

EXPENSE HIGHLIGHTS

PERSONNEL

We are projecting a 5 percent increase in total salaries from last year to this year. This includes an average 4-percent raise for each staffer (although increases are merit-based) and additional time for Jake – which is necessary to manage RTDNA and RTDNF.

Higher salaries lead to higher payroll taxes.

We have budgeted for a 15 percent increase in health care, but our costs are projected to decline because of the staffers participating in the program (mostly young with no children).

Unfortunately for SPJ's bottom line, nearly all of its employees are now signed up for the 401k program. On the flip side, it's one of the great benefits we offer. And it's a good way to attract and retain good people.

Other than hiring a new post-graduate communications intern, no other personnel changes are included in this budget. Given the right situation, however, this doesn't preclude us from hiring if need be.

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS

We have no large projects planned for FY2014. However, we always budget this expense should something need to be fixed that can be capitalized. Also, we always plan for upgrades to our awards platform.

COMPUTER SERVICES

We are budgeting to replace three towers and purchase a few iPads. However, I am researching the viability of taking SPJ into the cloud. Doing so would eliminate the need for towers. We pay a significant amount of money to a third-party company to maintain and maintenance our servers, desktops and other technology. Staff (namely me) also spends several hours each year dealing with issues. At some point, a server will break – setting us back about \$6,000 and creating significant headaches. They are at the end of their life-cycle. I believe it's in SPJ's best interest to “rent” its technology and live in the cloud – assuming it's safe and financially feasible.

POSTAGE AND PRINTING

With our new online system, we plan to mail only final dues notices to members (except those that don't have an e-mail address). This will significantly reduce the amount we spend on printing and mailing.

EMPLOYEE TRAVEL

This increase is mainly a result of our Scripps Leadership Road Show, which requires two staffers to make four trips during the year. Furthermore, I have budgeted money for us to attend other journalism conferences and meet with other groups regarding association management services.

TRAINER FEES

We are planning to conduct more Saturday Workshops, which require more trainers than our past educational offerings (such as newsroom training programs). I should note that we do our best to find local people in order to reduce this cost. But, to be conservative, this assumes we pay everyone.

OUTSIDE SERVICES

Because we will no longer be printing/ mailing two paper invoices, we will no longer need a company to manage this process for us. Staff can manage stuffing/ mailing final notices each month. However, AV and internet costs for EIJ13 exceed EIJ12.

EVENTS, MEALS AND BANQUETS

This is a technical increase. In the past, our Scripps program was coded as "facility rental" because we paid one giant bill to the hotel. This year, the program is structured a bit differently. Therefore, we are coding most of our Scripps expenses to events, meals and banquets.

FACILITY RENTAL

See above.

FREELANCE

We plan to beef up our Quill offerings, generating some online-only content.

PARTICIPANT/SPEAKER TRAVEL

SPJ will not be conducting a Reporter's Institute in FY2014. Therefore, we will not be paying to house 30 program attendees for three nights.

WHAT THIS BUDGET DOESN'T INCLUDE

SPJ Awards Platform revenue: We continue to market the platform, and have attempted to reach beyond the journalism community. But there is no guarantee we will get a single taker. As is my conservative nature, I've left it out. Anything we get will be gravy.

NAHJ paid us a fee to join EIJ13. Most of that fee will come in before FY2014 begins. Furthermore, they have not decided if they will join us in EIJ14. Therefore, I'm not counting on it.

SUMMARY

For the first time since 2008, SPJ is in a position to be a bit more aggressive and expand its offerings – without fear of significant financial setbacks.

Given everything above, we are projecting a budget surplus of \$36,673. This gives us a little wiggle room should some of our revenue projects fall short (or our expenses exceed expectations).

If EIJ13 performs better than EIJ12, that surplus should grow.

If we are successful in selling a few awards platforms, that surplus should grow.

If we are successful in bringing on more association management clients, that surplus should grow.

In conclusion, I believe this proposed budget is safe, even though it's not as conservative as past years. If any of the situations above occur, or other revenue streams outpace expectations, we stand to have another incredibly successful year.

Composite View

Proposed Budget				
Society of Professional Journalists				
FY 2014	Proposed Budget		Adopted Budget	Variance
Revenue	FY 2014		FY 2013	
Contributions/Grants	\$ 478,289.55		\$ 485,406.69	\$ (7,117.14)
Membership Dues	\$ 420,911.77		\$ 426,175.78	\$ (5,264.01)
Advertising Revenue	\$ 36,000.00		\$ 40,000.00	\$ (4,000.00)
Merchandise Sales	\$ 15,475.00		\$ 10,825.00	\$ 4,650.00
Interest/Dividends	\$ 1,209.52		\$ 1,209.52	\$ -
Subscriptions Revenue	\$ 18,100.00		\$ 19,128.00	\$ (1,028.00)
Awards Revenue	\$ 203,500.00		\$ 196,200.00	\$ 7,300.00
Registration Fees	\$ 151,350.00		\$ 196,150.00	\$ (44,800.00)
Royalties/Membership Benefits/Supplementary	\$ 30,793.75		\$ 21,866.08	\$ 8,927.67
Lease Management	\$ 27,293.00		\$ 26,000.00	\$ 1,293.00
Association Management	\$ 52,800.00		\$ 24,000.00	\$ 28,800.00
Awards Platform Sales	\$ -		\$ -	\$ -
SDX Foundation Management	\$ 212,696.43		\$ 207,124.42	\$ 5,572.00
Total Revenue	\$ 1,648,419.01		\$ 1,654,085.49	\$ (5,666.47)
Expenses				
Salaries	\$ 594,444.04		\$ 563,580.85	\$ 30,863.19
Payroll Taxes	\$ 50,374.97		\$ 48,013.94	\$ 2,361.03
Health Insurance	\$ 88,886.99		\$ 89,858.37	\$ (971.38)
401k Match	\$ 30,368.58		\$ 24,775.91	\$ 5,592.67
Employee Education/Training	\$ 3,500.00		\$ 3,500.00	\$ -
Payroll Related Charges	\$ 7,900.00		\$ 7,950.00	\$ (50.00)
Workers Compensation Insurance	\$ 1,586.10		\$ 1,428.00	\$ 158.10
Liability Insurance	\$ 13,887.30		\$ 13,451.76	\$ 435.54
Property Taxes	\$ -		\$ -	\$ -
Utilities	\$ 18,511.68		\$ 20,510.61	\$ (1,998.93)
Telephone	\$ 11,377.60		\$ 10,696.40	\$ 681.20
Building Maintenance	\$ 25,500.00		\$ 25,500.00	\$ -
Capital Improvements	\$ 6,500.00		\$ 12,200.00	\$ (5,700.00)
Board Related Expenditures	\$ 51,500.00		\$ 54,500.00	\$ (3,000.00)
Equipment Rental	\$ 9,660.00		\$ 9,706.00	\$ (46.00)
Software Maintenance/Upgrades	\$ 14,500.00		\$ 13,013.00	\$ 1,487.00
Internet Connectivity	\$ 1,900.00		\$ 1,900.00	\$ -
Website Expense/Maintenance	\$ 6,025.00		\$ 6,785.00	\$ (760.00)
Computer Services/Consulting/Maintenance	\$ 21,760.00		\$ 16,910.00	\$ 4,850.00
Audit/Accounting Fees	\$ 17,000.00		\$ 16,900.00	\$ 100.00
Legal Fees	\$ 60,000.00		\$ 60,000.00	\$ -
Office Supplies	\$ 10,722.00		\$ 7,858.00	\$ 2,864.00
Postage/Shipping	\$ 39,217.33		\$ 48,826.60	\$ (9,609.27)
Printing	\$ 66,499.50		\$ 71,633.95	\$ (5,134.45)
Employment Recruiting	\$ 2,000.00		\$ 2,000.00	\$ -
Dues and Subscriptions	\$ 6,730.00		\$ 7,255.00	\$ (525.00)
Employee Travel/Meals	\$ 43,179.00		\$ 35,880.00	\$ 7,299.00
Merchant Fees/Credit Card Processing	\$ 26,940.00		\$ 26,490.00	\$ 450.00
Investment Account Fees/Banking Fees	\$ 2,820.00		\$ 2,820.00	\$ -
Trainer fees	\$ 22,500.00		\$ 12,750.00	\$ 9,750.00
401(k)/POP Related Charges	\$ -		\$ -	\$ -
Contributions/Grants/Awards	\$ 31,838.08		\$ 31,683.08	\$ 155.00
Miscellaneous Expense	\$ 300.00		\$ 561.02	\$ (261.02)
Outside Services	\$ 108,400.84		\$ 103,907.20	\$ 4,493.64
Events, Meals and Banquets	\$ 111,826.00		\$ 84,494.00	\$ 27,332.00
Facilities Rental	\$ 12,800.00		\$ 31,831.00	\$ (19,031.00)
Marketing	\$ 19,000.00		\$ 17,240.00	\$ 1,760.00
Free Lance labor	\$ 27,700.00		\$ 23,300.00	\$ 4,400.00
Participant/Speaker Travel	\$ 44,091.00		\$ 57,265.00	\$ (13,174.00)
				\$ -
Total Expenses	\$ 1,611,746.01		\$ 1,566,974.69	\$ 44,771.32
Net Change in Assets	\$ 36,673.01		\$ 87,110.80	\$ (50,437.79)
Reserve Repayment	\$ -		\$ 65,000.00	\$ (65,000.00)
Cash on Hand from Previous Year	\$ -		\$ 5,004.20	\$ (5,004.20)
Net Change in Assets	\$ 36,673.01		\$ 27,115.00	\$ 9,558.01

Revenue Variance Analysis 2014 Budget vs 2013 Budget	2014 Budget	2013 Budget	Variance
Contributions/Grants/Sponsorships			
Sponsorships - Convention	\$ 50,000.00	\$ 62,030.67	\$ (12,030.67)
SDX Grant Convention	\$ 87,500.00	\$ 85,475.00	\$ 2,025.00
SDX Grant Training Place Workshops	\$ 187,722.00	\$ 186,342.00	\$ 1,380.00
SDX Grant Diversity Outreach	\$ 7,570.00	\$ 6,210.00	\$ 1,360.00
SDX Grant Mark of Excellence	\$ 27,201.00	\$ 27,201.00	\$ -
SDX Grant Communications Committee	\$ -	\$ 3,000.00	\$ (3,000.00)
SDX Grant On-Line On Demand Training	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
SDX Grant Chapter Education Grant	\$ 7,660.00	\$ 5,523.00	\$ 2,137.00
Scripps Leadership Grant	\$ 50,000.00	\$ 50,000.00	\$ -
Post Grad Intern SDX Sponsorship	\$ 34,136.55	\$ 34,126.27	\$ 10.28
Conference Sponsorships	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Quill Endowment Grant	\$ 13,000.00	\$ 12,998.75	\$ 1.25
Membership - Presidents Club	\$ 9,000.00	\$ 8,500.00	\$ 500.00
Contributions/Grants/Sponsorships	\$ 473,789.55	\$ 481,406.69	\$ (7,617.14)
Membership Dues			
Lifetime	\$ 3,860.00	\$ 3,372.00	\$ 488.00
Professional	\$ 291,816.00	\$ 297,642.00	\$ (5,826.00)
Associate	\$ 8,073.19	\$ 8,150.00	\$ (76.81)
Household	\$ 2,207.91	\$ 1,942.00	\$ 265.91
Retired	\$ 23,521.88	\$ 23,450.00	\$ 71.88
Post Graduate	\$ 21,458.71	\$ 19,734.00	\$ 1,724.71
Student	\$ 62,640.08	\$ 64,564.00	\$ (1,923.92)
Collegiate	\$ 7,334.00	\$ 7,322.00	\$ 12.00
Total	\$ 420,911.76	\$ 426,176.00	\$ (5,264.25)
Advertising Revenue			
Quill	\$ 10,000.00	\$ 15,000.00	\$ (5,000.00)
Convention	\$ 6,000.00	\$ 10,000.00	\$ (4,000.00)
Electronic	\$ 20,000.00	\$ 15,000.00	\$ 5,000.00
Total	\$ 36,000.00	\$ 40,000.00	\$ (4,000.00)
Merchadise Sales	\$ 15,475.00	\$ 10,825.00	\$ 4,650.00
Interest/Dividends	\$ 1,209.52	\$ 1,209.52	\$ -
Subscription Revenue			
Quill	\$ 18,100.00	\$ 19,128.00	\$ (1,028.00)
Total	\$ 18,100.00	\$ 19,128.00	\$ (1,028.00)
Awards Revenue			
MOE Awards	\$ 63,000.00	\$ 61,200.00	\$ 1,800.00
SDX Awards	\$ 138,750.00	\$ 135,000.00	\$ 3,750.00
New American Award	\$ 1,250.00	\$ -	\$ 1,250.00
High School Essay	\$ 500.00	\$ -	\$ 500.00
Total	\$ 203,500.00	\$ 196,200.00	\$ 6,800.00

Revenue Variance Analysis 2014 Budget vs 2013 Budget	2014 Budget	2013 Budget	Variance
Registration Fees			
Convention	\$ 134,500.00	\$ 178,950.00	\$ (44,450.00)
Training Place Workshops	\$ 10,850.00	\$ 12,800.00	\$ (1,950.00)
Narrative Writing Workshops	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Newroom Training	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Scripps Leadership	\$ 6,000.00	\$ 4,400.00	\$ 1,600.00
Spring Conference Planning	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Total	\$ 151,350.00	\$ 196,150.00	\$ (44,800.00)
Royalties/Membership Benefits/Supplementary			
Convenvention	\$ 18,393.75	\$ 7,000.00	\$ 11,393.75
Quill Management	\$ -	\$ 2,416.08	\$ (2,416.08)
Membership Program	\$ 12,400.00	\$ 12,450.00	\$ (50.00)
Total	\$ 30,793.75	\$ 21,866.08	\$ 8,927.67
Lease Management	\$ 27,293.00	\$ 26,000.00	\$ 1,293.00
Association Management	\$ 52,800.00	\$ 24,000.00	\$ 28,800.00
SDX Foundation Management	\$ 212,696.43	\$ 207,124.42	\$ 5,572.01
SDX Foundation Software/Supplies/Fees Associated Expenses	\$ 4,500.00	\$ 4,000.00	\$ 500.00
TRNA Fund Use	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Total Difference In Budgeted Revenue	\$ 1,648,419.01	\$ 1,654,085.71	\$ (6,166.71)

Expense Breakdown

Budget composed of three major expense categories

Personnel Costs:

Includes salaries, health/disability insurance, payroll taxes, 401k matching. Joe sets salary and personnel changes.

401 k match includes all current participating eligible employees.

Direct Costs of Running our Budgeted Programs:

Examples includes shipping costs for MOE Awards, Employee travel, printing for programs, etc.

Staff responsible for each program determines what activities that need to be performed to put on say a training program and then estimate the costs to make the activity happen utilizing quotes and in most cases actual estimated costs.

Allocated Costs:

These are costs that are shared equally across all program activities and in most cases SDX Management as well.

Utilities costs, telephone charges, board related expenditures, audit and accounting fees, legal, etc.

building maintenance costs

Personnel Costs:	\$ 764,074.58	47.41%
Direct Costs:	\$ 518,353.75	32.16%
Allocated Expenditures:	\$ 329,317.68	20.43%
Total Expenditures	\$ 1,611,746.01	100.00%

Income Breakdown:

Grants	\$ 372,153.00	22.58%
Contributions	\$ 9,000.00	0.55%
Sponsorships	\$ 50,000.00	3.03%
Quill Endowment Interest	\$ 13,000.00	0.79%
SDX Intern Sponsorship	\$ 34,136.55	2.07%
Membership Dues	\$ 420,911.77	25.53%
Advertising Revenue	\$ 36,000.00	2.18%
Interest/Dividends	\$ 1,209.52	0.07%
Subscription Revenue	\$ 18,100.00	1.10%
Awards Revenue	\$ 203,500.00	12.35%
Registration Fees	\$ 151,350.00	9.18%
Merchandise Sales	\$ 15,475.00	0.94%
Royalties, Misc	\$ 30,793.75	1.87%
Lease Management	\$ 27,293.00	1.66%
Association Management	\$ 52,800.00	3.20%
Reimbursement of SDX Costs	\$ 212,696.43	12.90%
Total	\$ 1,648,419.01	100.00%
		100.00%

Awards

**Proposed Budget
Society of Professional Journalists
FY 2014
Revenue**

	General Awards Program	Mark of Excellence Awards	Sigma Delta Chi Awards	Total Awards
Contributions/Grants	\$-	\$27,201.00	\$-	\$27,201.00
Membership Dues	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$0.00
Advertising Revenue	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$0.00
Merchandise Sales	\$-	\$375.00	\$12,600.00	\$12,975.00
Interest/Dividends	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$0.00
Subscriptions Revenue	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$0.00
Awards Revenue	\$1,750.00	\$63,000.00	\$138,750.00	\$203,500.00
Registration Fees	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$0.00
Royalties/Membership Benefits/Supplementary	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$0.00
Lease Management	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$0.00
Association Management	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$0.00
Awards Platform Sales	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$0.00
SDX Foundation Management	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$0.00
Total Revenue	\$1,750.00	\$90,576.00	\$151,350.00	\$243,676.00

Expenses

Salaries	\$9,089.23	\$19,068.37	\$19,068.37	\$47,225.97
Payroll Taxes	\$779.33	\$1,719.45	\$1,719.45	\$4,218.23
Health Insurance	\$2,409.89	\$4,779.23	\$4,779.23	\$11,968.35
401k Match	\$632.61	\$1,249.30	\$1,249.30	\$3,131.21
Employee Education/Training	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$0.00
Payroll Related Charges	\$120.79	\$253.41	\$253.41	\$627.61
Workers Compensation Insurance	\$24.25	\$50.88	\$50.88	\$126.01
Liability Insurance	\$212.34	\$445.47	\$445.47	\$1,103.28
Property Taxes	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$0.00
Utilities	\$164.17	\$344.41	\$344.41	\$852.99
Telephone	\$173.97	\$364.97	\$364.97	\$903.91
Building Maintenance	\$194.95	\$408.99	\$408.99	\$1,012.93
Capital Improvements	\$-	\$1,000.00	\$500.00	\$1,500.00
Board Related Expenditures	\$787.45	\$1,652.00	\$1,652.00	\$4,091.45
Equipment Rental	\$147.70	\$309.87	\$309.87	\$767.44
Software Maintenance/Upgrades	\$214.06	\$449.09	\$449.09	\$1,112.24
Internet Connectivity	\$29.05	\$60.95	\$60.95	\$150.95
Website Expense/Maintenance	\$92.12	\$193.27	\$193.27	\$478.66
Computer Services/Consulting/Maintenance	\$309.78	\$649.89	\$649.89	\$1,609.56
Audit/Accounting Fees	\$259.94	\$545.32	\$545.32	\$1,350.58
Legal Fees	\$917.42	\$1,924.66	\$1,924.66	\$4,766.74
Office Supplies	\$241.74	\$492.47	\$492.47	\$1,226.68

Awards

Postage/Shipping	\$377.94	\$5,133.12	\$7,174.12	\$12,685.18
Printing	\$15.29	\$2,032.08	\$4,482.08	\$6,529.45
Employment Recruiting	\$30.58	\$64.16	\$64.16	\$158.90
Dues and Subscriptions	\$24.46	\$51.32	\$51.32	\$127.10
Employee Travel/Meals	\$84.10	\$176.43	\$2,276.43	\$2,536.96
Merchant Fees/Credit Card Processing	\$405.04	\$1,099.74	\$1,049.74	\$2,554.52
Investment Account Fees/Banking Fees	\$43.12	\$90.46	\$90.46	\$224.04
Trainer fees	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$0.00
401(k)/POP Related Charges	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$0.00
Contributions/Grants/Awards	\$5,684.00	\$4,664.08	\$13,490.00	\$23,838.08
Miscellaneous Expense	\$4.59	\$9.62	\$9.62	\$23.83
Outside Services	\$-	\$4,900.00	\$4,750.00	\$9,650.00
Events, Meals and Banquets	\$91.74	\$3,392.47	\$29,489.47	\$32,973.68
Facilities Rental	\$45.87	\$96.23	\$96.23	\$238.33
Marketing	\$137.61	\$288.70	\$5,288.70	\$5,715.01
Free Lance labor	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$0.00
Participant/Speaker Travel	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$0.00
				\$0.00
Total Expenses	\$23,745.14	\$57,960.39	\$103,774.31	\$185,479.84
				\$0.00
Net Change in Assets	(\$21,995.14)	\$32,615.61	\$47,575.69	\$58,196.16

Communications

Proposed Budget

SPJ

FY 2014

Revenue

	Quill	Other Comm.	Electronic Programs	Total Communications
Contributions/Grants/Sponsorships	\$13,000.00	\$-	\$-	\$13,000.00
Membership Dues	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$0.00
Advertising Revenue	\$10,000.00	\$-	\$20,000.00	\$30,000.00
Merchandise Sales	\$100.00	\$-	\$-	\$100.00
Interest/Dividends	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$0.00
Subscriptions Revenue	\$18,100.00	\$-	\$-	\$18,100.00
Awards Revenue	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$0.00
Registration Fees	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$0.00
Royalties/Member Benefits/Supplementary	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$0.00
Lease Management	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$0.00
Association Management	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$0.00
Awards Platform Sales	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$0.00
SDX Foundation Management	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$0.00
				\$0.00
Total Revenue	\$41,200.00	\$-	\$20,000.00	\$61,200.00

Expenses

Salaries	\$39,020.61	\$16,253.30	\$36,216.56	\$91,490.47
Payroll Taxes	\$3,289.58	\$1,647.54	\$3,040.07	\$7,977.19
Health Insurance	\$6,628.58	\$1,659.10	\$922.46	\$9,210.14
401k Match	\$2,060.24	\$388.69	\$172.83	\$2,621.76
Employee Education/Training	\$1,500.00	\$-	\$-	\$1,500.00
Payroll Related Charges	\$518.57	\$216.00	\$481.31	\$1,215.88
Workers Compensation Insurance	\$104.12	\$43.37	\$96.63	\$244.12
BOP Insurance Policy	\$911.59	\$379.71	\$846.09	\$2,137.39
Property Taxes	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$0.00
Utilities	\$704.79	\$293.57	\$654.14	\$1,652.50
Telephone	\$746.85	\$311.09	\$693.18	\$1,751.12
Building Maintenance	\$836.94	\$348.61	\$776.80	\$1,962.35
Capital Improvements	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$0.00
Board Related Expenditures	\$3,380.57	\$1,408.11	\$3,137.64	\$7,926.32
Equipment Rental	\$634.10	\$264.12	\$588.54	\$1,486.76
Software Maintenance/Upgrades	\$1,418.99	\$382.79	\$852.95	\$2,654.73
Internet Connectivity	\$124.72	\$51.95	\$115.76	\$292.43
Website Expense/Maintenance	\$395.49	\$164.74	\$367.07	\$927.30
Computer Related Equipment	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$0.00
Computer Services/Consulting/Maint.	\$2,829.91	\$553.95	\$1,234.34	\$4,618.20
Audit/Accounting Fees	\$1,115.92	\$464.81	\$1,035.73	\$2,616.46
Legal Fees	\$3,938.53	\$1,640.52	\$3,655.51	\$9,234.56
Office Supplies	\$393.85	\$164.05	\$365.55	\$923.45
Postage/Shipping	\$15,650.46	\$41.01	\$91.39	\$15,782.86
Printing	\$48,449.64	\$27.34	\$60.93	\$48,537.91

Communications

Employment Recruiting	\$131.28	\$54.68	\$121.85	\$307.81
Dues and Subscriptions	\$105.03	\$43.75	\$97.48	\$246.26
Employee Travel/Meals	\$361.03	\$150.38	\$335.09	\$846.50
Merchant Fees/Credit Card Processing	\$1,738.86	\$724.29	\$1,613.91	\$4,077.06
Investment Account Fees/Banking Fees	\$185.11	\$77.10	\$171.81	\$434.02
Trainer fees	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$0.00
401k/POP Related Charges	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$0.00
Contributions/Grants/Awards	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$0.00
Miscellaneous Expense	\$19.69	\$8.20	\$18.28	\$46.17
Outside Services	\$2,000.00	\$-	\$4,000.00	\$6,000.00
Events, Meals and Banquets	\$393.85	\$164.05	\$365.55	\$923.45
Facilities Rental	\$196.93	\$82.03	\$182.78	\$461.74
Marketing	\$590.78	\$246.08	\$548.33	\$1,385.19
Free Lance labor	\$27,700.00	\$-	\$-	\$27,700.00
Participant Travel	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$0.00
Total Expenses	\$168,076.64	\$28,254.93	\$62,860.53	\$259,192.10
Net Change in Assets	(\$126,876.64)	(\$28,254.93)	(\$42,860.53)	(\$197,992.10)

Educational Programs

**Proposed Budget
SPJ
FY 2014
Revenue**

	Convention	Training Place Workshops	Diversity Outreach	Scripps Leadership Institute	Chapter Education Grants	Total Programs
Contributions/Grants/Sponsorships	\$137,500.00	\$187,722.00	\$7,570.00	\$50,000.00	\$7,660.00	\$390,452.00
Membership Dues	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$0.00
Advertising Revenue	\$6,000.00	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$6,000.00
Merchandise Sales	\$2,400.00	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$2,400.00
Interest/Dividends	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$0.00
Subscriptions Revenue	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$0.00
Awards Revenue	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$0.00
Registration Fees	\$134,500.00	\$10,850.00	\$-	\$6,000.00	\$-	\$151,350.00
Royalties/Membership Benefits/Supplementary	\$18,393.75	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$18,393.75
Lease Management	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$0.00
Association Management	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$0.00
Awards Platform Sales	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$0.00
SDX Foundation Management	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$0.00
Total Revenue	\$298,793.75	\$198,572.00	\$7,570.00	\$56,000.00	\$7,660.00	\$568,595.75

Expenses

Salaries	\$64,313.34	\$68,981.85	\$-	\$10,172.72	\$719.80	\$144,187.71
Payroll Taxes	\$5,572.67	\$6,082.01	\$-	\$858.71	\$62.07	\$12,575.46
Health Insurance	\$13,455.95	\$11,075.41	\$-	\$1,293.87	\$9.91	\$25,835.14
401k Match	\$3,508.93	\$3,184.17	\$-	\$344.73	\$-	\$7,037.83
Employee Education/Training	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$0.00
Payroll Related Charges	\$854.71	\$916.75	\$-	\$135.19	\$9.57	\$1,916.22
Workers Compensation Insurance	\$171.60	\$184.06	\$-	\$27.14	\$1.92	\$384.72
BOP Insurance Policy	\$1,502.48	\$1,611.54	\$-	\$237.65	\$16.82	\$3,368.49
Property Taxes	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$0.00
Utilities	\$1,161.62	\$1,245.94	\$-	\$183.74	\$13.00	\$2,604.30
Telephone	\$1,230.95	\$1,320.31	\$-	\$194.70	\$13.78	\$2,759.74
Building Maintenance	\$1,379.43	\$1,479.56	\$-	\$218.19	\$15.44	\$3,092.62
Capital Improvements	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$0.00

Educational Programs

Board Related Expenditures	\$5,571.82	\$5,976.28	\$-	\$881.32	\$62.36	\$12,491.78
Equipment Rental	\$1,045.12	\$1,120.99	\$-	\$165.31	\$11.70	\$2,343.12
Software Maintenance/Upgrades	\$1,514.67	\$1,624.62	\$-	\$239.58	\$16.95	\$3,395.82
Internet Connectivity	\$205.56	\$220.48	\$-	\$32.51	\$2.30	\$460.85
Website Expense/Maintenance	\$651.85	\$699.17	\$-	\$103.11	\$7.30	\$1,461.43
Computer Related Equipment	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$0.00
Computer Services/Consulting/Maintenance	\$2,191.94	\$2,351.06	\$-	\$346.71	\$24.53	\$4,914.24
Audit/Accounting Fees	\$1,839.24	\$1,972.75	\$-	\$290.92	\$20.59	\$4,123.50
Legal Fees	\$6,491.44	\$6,962.66	\$-	\$1,026.78	\$72.65	\$14,553.53
Office Supplies	\$2,221.14	\$1,056.27	\$-	\$2,142.68	\$7.27	\$5,427.36
Postage/Shipping	\$2,781.62	\$1,224.07	\$-	\$25.67	\$1.82	\$4,033.18
Printing	\$6,149.69	\$1,300.04	\$20.00	\$17.11	\$1.21	\$7,488.05
Employment Recruiting	\$216.38	\$232.09	\$-	\$34.23	\$2.42	\$485.12
Dues and Subscriptions	\$173.11	\$185.67	\$1,980.00	\$27.38	\$1.94	\$2,368.10
Employee Travel/Meals	\$22,190.05	\$5,158.24	\$-	\$4,558.12	\$6.66	\$31,913.07
Merchant Fees/Credit Card Processing	\$2,865.97	\$3,074.01	\$-	\$453.32	\$32.08	\$6,425.38
Investment Account Fees/Banking Fees	\$305.10	\$327.24	\$-	\$48.26	\$3.41	\$684.01
Trainer fees	\$-	\$22,500.00	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$22,500.00
401k/POP Related Charges	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$0.00
Contributions/Grants/Awards	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$8,000.00	\$8,000.00
Miscellaneous Expense	\$32.46	\$34.81	\$-	\$5.13	\$0.36	\$72.76
Outside Services	\$65,560.84	\$10,400.00	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$75,960.84
Events, Meals and Banquets	\$31,398.14	\$16,996.27	\$500.00	\$25,882.68	\$7.27	\$74,784.36
Facilities Rental	\$324.57	\$4,948.13	\$-	\$5,251.34	\$3.63	\$10,527.67
Marketing	\$973.72	\$1,044.40	\$-	\$154.02	\$10.90	\$2,183.04
Free Lance labor	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$0.00
Participant Travel	\$9,140.00	\$13,075.00	\$5,880.00	\$15,996.00	\$-	\$44,091.00
Total Expenses	\$256,996.12	\$198,565.86	\$8,380.00	\$71,348.83	\$9,159.64	\$544,450.45
Net Change in Assets	\$41,797.63	\$6.14	(\$810.00)	(\$15,348.83)	(\$1,499.64)	\$24,145.30

Membership

**Proposed Budget
SPJ
FY 2014
Revenue**

**Membership
Program**

Contributions/Grants/Sponsorships	\$9,000.00
Membership Dues	\$420,911.77
Advertising Revenue	\$-
Merchandise Sales	\$-
Interest/Dividends	\$-
Subscriptions Revenue	\$-
Awards Revenue	\$-
Registration Fees	\$-
Royalties/Membership Benefits/Supplementary	\$12,400.00
Lease Management	\$-
Association Management	\$-
Awards Platform Sales	\$-
SDX Foundation Management	\$-
Total Revenue	\$442,311.77

Expenses

Salaries	\$83,030.99
Payroll Taxes	\$7,220.67
Health Insurance	\$22,542.00
401k Match	\$4,410.54
Employee Education/Training	\$2,000.00
Payroll Related Charges	\$1,103.46
Workers Compensation Insurance	\$221.54
BOP Insurance Policy	\$1,939.76
Property Taxes	\$-
Utilities	\$1,499.70
Telephone	\$1,589.21
Building Maintenance	\$1,780.90
Capital Improvements	\$-
Board Related Expenditures	\$7,193.44
Equipment Rental	\$1,349.29
Software Maintenance/Upgrades	\$1,955.50
Internet Connectivity	\$265.39
Website Expense/Maintenance	\$841.56
Computer Related Equipment	\$-
Computer Services/Consulting/Maintenance	\$2,829.88
Audit/Accounting Fees	\$2,374.53
Legal Fees	\$8,380.70
Office Supplies	\$838.07
Postage/Shipping	\$6,139.52

Membership

Printing	\$3,559.68
Employment Recruiting	\$279.36
Dues and Subscriptions	\$223.49
Employee Travel/Meals	\$768.23
Merchant Fees/Credit Card Processing	\$3,700.08
Investment Account Fees/Banking Fees	\$393.89
Trainer fees	\$-
401k/POP Related Charges	\$-
Contributions/Grants/Awards	\$-
Miscellaneous Expense	\$41.90
Outside Services	\$16,790.00
Events, Meals and Banquets	\$838.07
Facilities Rental	\$419.04
Marketing	\$6,257.11
Free Lance labor	\$-
Participant Travel	\$-
Total Expenses	\$192,777.49
Net Change in Assets	\$249,534.28

**Proposed Budget
Society of Professional Journalists
FY 2014**

Revenue

	SDX Management	Management and General
Contributions/Grants	\$ -	\$ 38,636.55
Membership Dues	\$ -	\$ -
Advertising Revenue	\$ -	\$ -
Merchandise Sales	\$ -	\$ -
Interest/Dividends	\$ -	\$ 1,209.52
Subscriptions Revenue	\$ -	\$ -
Awards Revenue	\$ -	\$ -
Registration Fees	\$ -	\$ -
Royalties/Membership Benefits/Supplementary	\$ -	\$ -
Lease Management	\$ -	\$ 27,293.00
Association Management	\$ -	\$ 52,800.00
Awards Platform Sales	\$ -	\$ -
SDX Foundation Management	\$ 212,696.43	\$ -
Total Revenue	\$ 212,696.43	\$ 119,939.07

Expenses

Salaries	\$ 131,102.36	\$ 97,406.54
Payroll Taxes	\$ 10,694.33	\$ 7,689.10
Health Insurance	\$ 7,981.72	\$ 11,349.64
401k Match	\$ 7,724.13	\$ 5,443.10
Employee Education/Training	\$ -	\$ -
Payroll Related Charges	\$ 1,742.31	\$ 1,294.51
Workers Compensation Insurance	\$ 349.81	\$ 259.90
Liability Insurance	\$ 3,062.79	\$ 2,275.59
Property Taxes	\$ -	\$ -
Utilities	\$ 7,774.91	\$ 4,127.30
Telephone	\$ 2,509.29	\$ 1,864.35
Building Maintenance	\$ 12,750.00	\$ 4,901.20
Capital Improvements	\$ -	\$ 5,000.00
Board Related Expenditures	\$ -	\$ 19,797.00
Equipment Rental	\$ 2,130.48	\$ 1,582.90
Software Maintenance/Upgrades	\$ 3,087.65	\$ 2,294.06
Internet Connectivity	\$ 419.04	\$ 311.34
Website Expense/Maintenance	\$ 1,328.79	\$ 987.27
Computer Related Equipment	\$ -	\$ -
Computer Services/Consulting/Maintenance	\$ 4,468.27	\$ 3,319.84
Audit/Accounting Fees	\$ -	\$ 6,534.93
Legal Fees	\$ 13,232.77	\$ 9,831.69

Management

Office Supplies	\$	1,323.28	\$	983.17
Postage/Shipping	\$	-	\$	576.61
Printing	\$	-	\$	384.41
Employment Recruiting	\$	-	\$	768.82
Dues and Subscriptions	\$	352.87	\$	3,412.18
Employee Travel/Meals	\$	-	\$	7,114.24
Merchant Fees/Credit Card Processing	\$	-	\$	10,182.96
Investment Account Fees/Banking Fees	\$	-	\$	1,084.03
Trainer fees	\$	-	\$	-
401(k)/POP Related Charges	\$	-	\$	-
Contributions/Grants/Awards	\$	-	\$	-
Miscellaneous Expense	\$	-	\$	115.32
Outside Services	\$	-	\$	-
Events, Meals and Banquets	\$	-	\$	2,306.45
Facilities Rental	\$	661.64	\$	491.58
Marketing	\$	-	\$	3,459.67
Free Lance labor	\$	-	\$	-
Participant/Speaker Travel	\$	-	\$	-
Total Expenses	\$	212,696.43	\$	217,149.70
Net Change in Assets	\$	-	\$	(97,210.63)
Reserve Repayment	\$	-	\$	-
Cash on Hand from Previous Year	\$	-	\$	-
Net Change in Assets	\$	-	\$	(97,210.63)



SINCE 1909

THE NATIONAL JOURNALISM CENTER

3909 N. MERIDIAN ST.

INDIANAPOLIS, IND. 46208

317-927-8000

FAX: 317-920-4789

SPJ@SPJ.ORG

WWW.SPJ.ORG

MEMORANDUM

DATE: April 3, 2013
FROM: Tara Puckey, Chapter Coordinator
SUBJ: Chapter Action
FOR: SPJ Board of Directors

Below is a list of chapters requiring board action. In an effort to keep the board book to a manageable size I have opted not to include all the documentation sent to me, but it is all in order. If you would like to see a copy, I can provide that for you.

SEEKING TO BE CHARTERED

Delaware Pro	Region 2
Salisbury University	Region 2
Florida Atlantic University	Region 3
Waynesburg University	Region 4
University of Indianapolis	Region 5
Texas A&M San Antonio	Region 8

REACTIVATING (no action required...informational)

Marist College	Region 1
Long Island University	Region 1

CHAPTERS TO INACTIVATE

Because I'm now at HQ, I feel like it's time to get an accurate picture of where our chapters stand. The best way to do this is by using the annual reports that are due the first week of May.

Once the deadline has passed, I will schedule a call with each RD to talk about *every single chapter* in his or her region: old chapters, new chapters, up and coming chapters. We'll then be able to discuss the status of each chapter and the best course of action moving forward.

After those conversations take place, I'll present the board with a complete picture of all of the Society's chapters.



MEMORANDUM

DATE: April 7, 2013
FROM: Joe Skeel, Executive Director
SUBJ: Staff Report
FOR: SPJ Board of Directors

Because I email each of you weekly, providing an ongoing update of our efforts, this report will focus on big-picture items in the works or on the horizon.

AUTODRAFT DUES BILLING

SPJ will be purchasing an “add-on” for our database, which delivers the ability to initiate and manage automatic recurring charges. The software developers say implementation will take about 60 days from start to finish. It’s entirely possible the ball will be rolling by the time we meet in Indy.

Cost for implementation is about \$8,000-\$10,000. It’s important to note that this DOES NOT include the cost to tie it to our online join/renewal page on SPJ.org. To complete this phase will be another \$4,000-\$7,000.

In all likelihood, we will hold off on Phase 2 for a short time – certainly until after convention. However, we will put information on the site that autodraft is available. People will simply have to contact HQ to set it up. We will, of course, also include information with dues reminders, invoices and other member communication.

CHAPTER HEALTH

Tara has been working diligently in order to get a firm handle on our chapters. It has not been a smooth process. Many local chapter leaders don’t return phone calls or e-mails. It’s hard to help when they don’t communicate.

In many cases, we have membership dues checks we are attempting to send. With my support, Tara refuses to mail checks until she “speaks with a human.” Furthermore, she has faced challenges in getting chapters to attend the Scripps Leadership program – despite direct e-mails and phone calls to chapter members.

For our first Scripps program in Region 5, we had no representatives from Louisville Pro or the Bluegrass Chapter (two of the four pro chapters in the region). As I type this today – two days out from the Region 9 deadline – we have no one signed up from the Colorado Pro or Utah Headliners chapters (again, two of the four pro chapters in the region).

We are by no means throwing in the towel. But we have learned this: SPJ’s chapter structure is not healthy. It will take a lot of work to get it up and running like a well-oiled machine.

SPJ BRANDING

I have asked our more creative staffers to take a critical look at our branding: logos, letterhead, avatars, web graphics, etc., etc., etc.

The goal is simple: Ensure that SPJ's image reflects the progressive, industry-leading organization it wants to be. At this point, I don't envision a complete overhaul. But, we do want to identify outdated and inconsistent pieces and update or eradicate them.

CLOUD COMPUTING

Desktop computers and servers are my No. 1 enemy. Nothing sucks more of our time than faulty/slow equipment. Therefore, my goal is to eliminate them from 3909 Meridian St.

Our four servers (one of which houses our telephone system) are nearing the end of their expected life cycle. This makes them slow. More importantly, however, they will soon die.

When this happens, it will cost about \$4,000-\$6,000 to buy a new **one** and have our third-party IT company re-install all the necessary safety controls and software.

Furthermore, each time one of our work stations goes on the fritz, I try to fix it by running basic maintenance. If that doesn't work, and it rarely does, we call our IT firm – and pay them. At this point, I have spent fruitless time on the unit. And the person experiencing the trouble needs a temporary place to work. Because of this, we must have an “extra” work station available.

By going to the cloud, all of our “stuff” would be hosted by a third-party – software, files, etc., etc. We would have no servers in the building. And instead of work stations, staffers will work on “thin clients.” These look like tiny computers, but are little more than a gateway from 3909 to our host. Staffers could also work off their own devices – from anywhere in the world.

All system maintenance would be managed and performed by our host.

I still have questions, however: Mainly, security and cost. Cloud-based options charge a monthly fee. It may be more than what it costs to maintain our current structure over the long haul. If so, is that additional cost worth improvement in staff efficiency? Stay tuned.

FINANCIAL FUTURE

We have spent the past few years working to rebuild our cash reserves. Now, it's time for SPJ to think about long-term investment strategies. Currently, SPJ's investments consist of a low-interest, but very safe and liquid, money market. This preserves our capital and allows us to get our hands on the money if need be.

Over the next year or two, assuming the finances remain steady, I will be investigating the possibility of SPJ diving into the stock market – just as the SDX Foundation does. In fact, this is where the vast majority of the Foundation's assets are. It's more risky than a money market, for a variety of reasons. But, it also yields higher returns.

Be thinking: How risk-averse should SPJ be with its reserves? Should we use that money to buy stocks/bonds/funds, which could spin off interest/dividends and increase the value of our investments – and/or provide cash to SPJ’s operations? Or, should we be content with money in the bank, forsaking risky earnings potential for the safety of knowing the money will be there when we need it – regardless of market performance?

SDX AWARDS BANQUET / JOURNCAMP / EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING

The annual SDX Awards Banquet will be Friday, June 21 at the National Press Club in Washington, D.C. The following day, SPJ’s executive committee will meet while staff conducts its third JournCamp right down the hall. Mark your calendars. It’s gonna be an SPJPalooza!

EIJ BOARD MEETING TIMES

Just a reminder, the SPJ board will meet at 9 a.m. on Saturday, Aug. 24 and Tuesday, Aug. 27 in Anaheim. The SDX Foundation Board will meet at 9 a.m. on Sunday, Aug. 25. For a complete EIJ13 schedule, visit <http://excellenceinjournalism.org/schedule/>



MEMORANDUM

DATE: April 10, 2013
FROM: Joe Skeel, Executive Director
SUBJ: EIJ 16 recommendation
FOR: SPJ Board of Directors

SPJ staff recommends that the Board of Directors vote to approve New Orleans as the site for Excellence in Journalism 2016.

The room rate is \$169 per night. The dates would be Sept. 18-20.

The contract offer is from the Sheraton, the site of EIJ11. For those of you that remember, the location was superb – a short crawl from the French Quarter. It was also our first year in partnering with RTDNA. Going back five years later has some symbolism.

The largest complaints we heard in 2011 was that the meeting space was too small, with many sessions becoming standing-room only. Frankly, we didn't know what to expect as it was our first joint venture with RTDNA. Because we have a better handle on expected attendance, we have secured more space this time around.

HOW WE ARRIVED AT THIS RECOMMENDATION

- Before EIJ11 concluded in New Orleans, leaders and members began asking: When can we come back? This made it clear that NOLA was a desired location.
- We received dozens of responses to our request for proposals regarding EIJ 14, 15 and 16. When we receive these proposals from properties around the U.S., we focus more on the property and less on the year. We often go back to a property that we like and ask if they could host in a different year, if need be. Originally, we targeted the Marriott in New Orleans for EIJ15, but the dates didn't work out. So, we inquired with all legit NOLA properties regarding EIJ16.
- The proposal we received from the Sheraton was superior to the others.
- We had a great experience with the Sheraton staff in 2011.
- Because we are intimately familiar with the property, planning space will be a much easier, more efficient task.



MEMORANDUM

DATE: April 10, 2013
FROM: Dana Neuts, Secretary-Treasurer
SUBJ: Regional fund oversight
FOR: SPJ Board of Directors

Each region has varying traditions for raising and spending regional funds. Determining how regional funds can be used is left up to the regions on the understanding that regional funds may be used only for SPJ purposes and not for anyone's personal benefit.

- (1) Within 30 days of his or her election, the Regional Director (RD) shall appoint a treasurer from a chapter in his or her region to the position of Regional Treasurer.
- (2) The RD shall notify SPJ headquarters, all chapter presidents of the region and the incumbent treasurer of the name and chapter of the new Regional Treasurer and the amount of regional funds.
- (3) Regional funds shall be held in that chapter's primary checking account, and the Regional Treasurer shall keep a separate ledger of regional funds showing all income and expenditures.
- (4) If an incumbent Regional Treasurer is to be replaced, then he or she shall promptly transfer the entire amount of all regional funds by check to the new Regional Treasurer. The ledger and other bank records should also be transferred. If the replacement Regional Treasurer is associated with the same chapter and bank account, new signature cards will suffice to affect the change.
- (5) The RD shall request disbursement of funds in writing to the treasurer, with a clear explanation of the purpose of their use. Either letter or email requests showing date and time the request was sent shall be acceptable support. If the RD is requesting reimbursement for expenses already incurred, then an expense report supported by original, itemized receipts must be submitted to the Regional Treasurer. SPJ has a sample expense report that can be used.
- (6) All payouts of regional funds shall be made by check. There shall be no cash payments.
- (7) The RD shall make a monthly report of regional income, expenses and fund balance to the Regional Treasurer and all chapter presidents in the region.
- (8) If the treasurer is not satisfied that an expense request is legitimate, then he or she shall notify the RD and schedule a conference call with the national executive director to resolve the issue.



SINCE 1909

THE NATIONAL JOURNALISM CENTER

3909 N. MERIDIAN ST.

INDIANAPOLIS, IND. 46208

317-927-8000

FAX: 317-920-4789

SPJ@SPJ.ORG

WWW.SPJ.ORG

MEMORANDUM

DATE: March 19, 2013
FROM: Hagit Limor, LDF Committee Chairwoman
SUBJ: LDF Report
FOR: SPJ Board of Directors

EDITOR'S NOTE – This report was submitted prior to receiving three LDF requests the week of April 1. The board of directors will discuss these requests during the April 20 meeting.

In my six years on this committee, this by far has been the least active when it comes to the number of requests for grant funding. Below, I will summarize the cases which we have taken on thus far this term, but at the top of this report I would like to issue a request I've floated by the president and executive committee so that we could bring this before the full board at this annual meeting.

I believe the reason for a continuously decreasing number of requests for Legal Defense Fund grants has to do with the sheer limitation of what \$1,000 will do for anyone in the legal sphere. The Legal Defense Fund was set up to help journalists in dire times when threatened by legal action for which they sometimes need a quick response. For this reason, the voting members of the LDF committee, who consist of the Society's executive board plus the FOI committee chair, were empowered to award an amount quickly without having to bring it to the full board unless someone requested more than the \$1,000 limit.

Every year, we hold an LDF auction to replenish and bolster our funding to help journalists, yet in my years on the board we have rarely if ever awarded even what we raise annually, much less the \$149,000 that sits in the account. Why? I believe it is due to the stated limit. I propose we raise that limit to \$5,000 and publicize the availability of such funding to gain awareness within the journalism community.

Of course the full board still will vote on any amount exceeding the stated limit. This does not change the structure or ebb and flow of the workings of the committee from how it has functioned in the past. It simply restates to the profession that we are here for them and we recognize the inflation of the legal dollar.

One other note: the committee can always award a lesser amount if we feel that is warranted. Many of the requests we receive – indeed all the requests this term thus far – have come at NO cost to us. We have joined other journalism groups, as you'll see below, to add our name to causes.

Our spending this year: \$0.

Here are the cases we have joined:

10/15/2012

We joined an amicus request from the Reporters Committee for Freedom of the Press in a Federal Circuit access case, Apple v. Samsung, to support access to discovery documents in cases where trade secrecy is claimed.

Reuters had intervened in this case to ask that many of the discovery documents be unsealed. The trial judge ordered that many financial documents be released. Both Apple and Samsung appealed that order. Reuters chose not to pursue the appeal so the First Amendment Coalition stepped in to intervene.

When the federal court denied that request, the FAC filed an amicus brief countering the companies' arguments against the unsealing of the documents. The Reporters Committee also drafted a more general brief stressing the importance of access in cases like this and opposing the blanket secrecy often allowed any time alleged "trade secrets" are involved. The LDF Committee joined to support this effort.

10/29/2012

We joined another Reporters Committee amicus request to challenge the rubber-stamping by courts of Executive Branch requests to classify documents under the "national security" blanket.

The issue at the heart of Center for International Environmental Law v. U.S. Office of the Trade Representative, involved whether a D.C. trial court erred when it ordered the release of a document withheld under Exemption 1 of the Freedom of Information Act. That exemption allows the government and courts to withhold national security/classified information.

The only document at issue was a one-page position paper created during trade talks among dozens of Western nations more than a decade ago that spelled out rules that would have changed free trade and investment laws. The document was shared with 33 other countries, and the rules were never adopted.

The Department of Justice argued that the document is classified and that releasing it would damage foreign relations because the United States would betray the trust of other countries with whom it promised to keep the documents confidential. The trial court disagreed and ordered the document released. The DOJ appealed to the D. C. U.S. Court of Appeals.

The government argued that courts should not be permitted to second-guess classification claims made by the Executive Branch because courts lack expertise to make those determinations. The amicus brief we joined countered that that courts regularly scrutinize agency classification decisions, and that courts should retain their independent role rather than simply defer to the Executive Branch.

12/17/2012

We signed on to another Reporters Committee amicus brief to support nationwide access to public records.

In McBurney v. Young we asked the U.S. Supreme Court to reverse an appeals court decision restricting access to public records. Under the Virginia Freedom of Information Act, only state residents have access to public information. The same is true in Alabama, Arkansas, New Hampshire, New Jersey and Tennessee.

Even with an exemption for media in Virginia, we argued that the VFOIA is unconstitutional. The exemption does not cover international outlets or online media that serve Virginia residents. The brief argued that this law prevents all out-of-state media from obtaining public records, thereby restricting the media's ability to report on matters of public importance.

3/07/2013

Finally, in March we joined an amicus brief with a coalition of groups including the Florida Institute of Justice, the Florida Press Association, the First Amendment Foundation and the Reporters Committee to challenge Florida prison regulations that prohibit prisoners from possessing certain publications, now interpreted to include *Prison Legal News*.

The rules prohibit any publication that contains ads for certain calling and pen pal services, the purchase of products or services with stamps, and any prisoner employment. States get broad discretion from courts in how they run prisons so courts traditionally have supported their interpretations of what is allowed.

Prison Legal News argued the regulations were being used to prevent distribution of their publication to prisoners and that these restrictions violate the prisoners' First Amendment rights. The amicus brief adds that the regulations are arbitrary and do not achieve a legitimate objective.

Thank you to the committee for your prompt responses when we act, as we often have to give our answer in less than 24 hours. I look forward to working with you all during the rest of this term.



MEMORANDUM

DATE: April 1, 2013
FROM: Sonny Albarado, President
SUBJ: Social Media Guidelines
FOR: SPJ Board of Directors

After the Excellence in Journalism 2012 conference, I appointed a small task force to develop digital communication guidelines for SPJ leaders and to address specific issues arising from earlier discussions.

Brandon T. Ballenger, treasurer of the South Florida Pro Chapter, led the group, which included chapter coordinator Tara Puckey, director-at-large Carl Corry, and pro members James Pilcher and Victoria Reitano. SPJ's education director Scott Leadingham also helped early on. I commend them for the hard work they put into their mission.

What follows is a proposal for board action developed from recommendations the task force submitted to the Executive Committee in January.

SOCIAL MEDIA GUIDELINES SOCIETY OF PROFESSIONAL JOURNALISTS

PREAMBLE

The term "social media" in the context of these guidelines applies to a variety of online and mobile communications tools that SPJ leaders and members use to share information and opinions about the Society, its activities and its membership, and the broader journalism community.

The guidelines are intended to help SPJ leaders and members follow accepted best practices as they use social media in carrying out the Society's missions. Source material for these guidelines came from governmental agencies, nonprofits and some of the nation's largest businesses.

These guidelines will be posted on a page on SPJ's main website. That page also will explain how the organization uses social media, describe what platforms the Society uses and offer instruction on how chapters and local SPJ leaders can leverage social media to spread the word about events, news and the organization's overall mission.

THE SHORT VERSION

These guidelines can be summed up in two basic words: *Common Sense*.

DISCLOSURE

When discussing SPJ business on social media platforms — whether your own or those maintained by SPJ — always disclose your position with SPJ or clearly indicate your role in your profile description.

CONTENT

Because SPJ advocates for free speech, these guidelines will not dictate what individuals can or can't say on social media platforms. But use common sense.

In your own social media communications, state that you are speaking on your own and not on behalf of the organization when discussing issues related to SPJ and journalism controversies. It never hurts to use a disclaimer that says your comments or opinions are your own and do not represent the position of SPJ.

Remember that despite these precautions, others may still interpret what you say on social media as representing SPJ's "official" position. Take appropriate steps to counteract such interpretations.

Anyone using an official SPJ account or blog (including regional and committee blogs) should follow the guidelines listed below.

Content Guidelines for SPJ-branded Platforms

(Includes SPJ Network blogs and Facebook pages of national committees and regional directors)

- Remember: only SPJ's national president, or the president's designee, can speak on behalf of the organization.
- Any messages regarding SPJ policy or conveying news about the national organization or its formal position on various issues must be approved **by** the president (or in the president's absence by the president-elect or executive director).
- Any messages about SPJ policies, news or positions on various issues must first be presented through official SPJ channels (e.g. press release, Twitter account, Facebook and LinkedIn pages, committee blogs, etc.)
- Committee chairs and members are strongly encouraged to regularly use social media to communicate, not only among themselves, but with the larger journalism community.
- Prior review of all social-media posts is unnecessary, but statements that might be construed as SPJ's official stance should be cleared first through the president.
- Don't blindside your leaders. For example, regional directors and other national board members should alert the president or the executive director *before* publication of content about subject matter that should be reviewed, or is already under review, by national leadership.
- SPJ national board members, staff and other leaders should remember their duty to the organization when discussing SPJ business on social media.
- When in doubt, consult leadership.
- Be civil.
- Do not disclose private or proprietary information.
- Encourage discussion about SPJ and journalism in general.

LIVE EVENTS

When it comes to live, ongoing events, such as open board meetings and convention business, all members of SPJ's board and staff may "live tweet."

Again, use common sense: Impart news before or instead of opinion.

INVESTIGATIONS AND SOCIAL MEDIA

Occasionally, SPJ's president calls on regional directors or other members to determine facts regarding a journalism controversy – such as the dismissal of a student editor or student media adviser – so that the organization can decide whether to take a position and what that position might be.

Some guidelines for those called upon to help in this process:

- Before SPJ can issue an opinion on an event or controversy, it must perform due diligence and gather facts in keeping with journalistic standards.
- While facts are being gathered, the president or a designee should publicly acknowledge that SPJ is aware of the issue and researching the facts.
- SPJ officers, board members and national committee members should refrain from issuing unqualified opinions on the issue until an official statement is made.
- During an inquiry into an issue, the Society should use social media to update its members and the public on the inquiry's progress.
- The president will appoint investigators. When deemed appropriate by the president and executive director, the Society will reimburse reasonable travel expenses for an investigator.
- Investigator(s) must report findings to the president before disseminating them.
- If appropriate, the president or a designee will send letters or otherwise engage participants in a controversy with suggested remedies or changes.
- Upon completion of the inquiry and after any letters are sent, SPJ will issue a press release on all appropriate platforms about its findings and any position it takes.



MEMORANDUM

DATE: April 1, 2013
FROM: David Cuillier, President-Elect
SUBJ: Openness and Accountability Best Practices resources guide
FOR: SPJ Board of Directors

This memorandum outlines a proposal to foster openness to decrease theft and increase confidence and trust in SPJ among members and the public. The Openness and Accountability Best Practices resource guide (“SPJ FOI”) would be posted online, touted in Quill, and provided to current and future leaders along with the Finances Best Practices guide that is already disseminated.\

Clearly, as a non-profit entity, SPJ has no legal obligation to provide anything to anyone, except for IRS 990 forms. But given that the code of ethics calls for accountability of journalists, and that they “Abide by the same high standards to which they hold others,” there is a strong feeling in the organization that we should be as open as possible without overburdening volunteer leaders and compromising proprietary information that could hurt the organization (e.g., bank account numbers that could lead to theft).

Ultimately, it all comes down to building trust among members and the public, as well as protecting the funds, integrity and credibility of SPJ by thwarting human temptation through openness and accountability. As former U.S. Supreme Court Justice Louis Brandeis said, “Sunlight is said to be the best of disinfectants; electric light the most efficient policeman.”

BACKGROUND

Following the Oklahoma chapter theft uncovered in 2012, and other chapter-level and regional-level financial issues, a resolution was proposed at the fall convention in Fort Lauderdale to increase chapter financial transparency, spurring robust debate. While the resolution failed, the discussion prompted action this year among some chapters, who have since adopted practices and policies aimed to prevent theft and foster openness.

A task force assigned by former President John Ensslin developed best practices for chapter finance transparency, which seem to have helped expose problems in the Los Angeles chapter, and perhaps will elsewhere, so that chapters can avoid such issues in the future. Various members have been active in this front, including Secretary-Treasurer Dana Neuts, Regional Director Carl Corry and D.C. Pro board member Andy Schotz.

The discussion has expanded beyond chapter financial transparency, however, to include overall accountability and openness of chapters, regional directors and national headquarters. President Sonny Albarado asked that I gather information about the issue, synthesize it, and provide some recommendations to the

Executive Board to talk about at the winter meeting Jan. 19, 2013. The board discussed the ideas and put forth recommendations for the full board. This memo outlines that information and potential action steps.

CHAPTERS TAKING INITIATIVE

The Press Club of Long Island, which proposed an openness resolution at the 2012 annual convention, adopted a chapter policy for openness in December 2012. They approved the policy with the intention of attracting new members, avoiding perceptions of hypocrisy, and demonstrating that SPJ practices the same accountability and openness that it preaches to government. The policy was posted on the SPJ blog “Garden Center” on Dec. 21 (<http://bit.ly/Vb2Ccs>). Four people provided feedback in the comments section, all positive. The policy states:

- The Press Club of Long Island board will post notice on the PCLI website of upcoming board meetings by the next business day after they are scheduled by the president or another officer in the president’s absence.
- Members with issues for the board to address should contact the president or another officer in the president’s absence at least one business day before a meeting and the president or another officer in the president’s absence will add the issue to the agenda.
- Board meetings are open to all PCLI members, who will be allowed to attend as observers but will be given the opportunity to address the board during the meeting where appropriate.
- A summary of all votes/actions taken by the board during a meeting will be posted on the website within five business days of the meeting.
- A summary of chapter finances is available for review by PCLI members by appointment.
- The board will respond to media requests for information on PCLI activities or comments on media issues as quickly as possibly but always within two business days.

Other chapters, as well, have begun adopting their own policies following the Oklahoma problem and debate in Fort Lauderdale. Connecticut pro is considering adopting policies that would post minutes on its website, increase financial audits on the treasurer from once a year to twice a year, and setting dollar amounts for multiple approvers of expenses. The D.C. Pro chapter now reviews all bank statements at board meetings.

CHAPTER LEADER COMMENTS

On Jan. 3, I sent an email to the 236 chapter presidents, including student chapters, asking for their suggestions and thoughts regarding these openness issues. I received eight replies. Not many, but they did give me a sense of some of the concerns among chapter leaders (if you would like to see all the comments, feel free let me know and I can email them to you). A few commonalities arose:

- Some leaders are wary of national imposing detailed guidelines on local chapters, but are willing to voluntarily adopt their own practices.
- Leaders generally favor openness policies as long as they don’t overburden themselves or their officers. Simple is crucial.

- Chapters generally announce their meeting times/dates but often don't make minutes easily accessible.
- Most chapters are fine with their meetings being open to the public, as well as most of the recommendations in the best practices. Finding someone to consistently carry out the tasks, however, can be tricky (updating the website with minutes, meeting notices, etc.).
- Leaders are fine with opening their books up to anyone, but they don't advertise the fact and don't see a need to do so proactively, only if asked (too busy!).
- It seems many chapters are provided financial reports monthly or every so often. However, they appear to be summaries from a treasurer, not including the actual bank statements. This appears to be a crucial area of vulnerability. It's easy for treasurers to make up numbers and summaries. Reviewing actual bank statements might help.

OPENNESS AND ACCOUNTABILITY BEST PRACTICES

The Openness and Accountability Best Practices resource guide (see below) would be voluntary for chapters and regional directors, providing specific tips and model policies that can be adopted by chapters to foster trust, credibility and theft prevention. The best practices were gleaned from public meeting laws, public record laws and common practice.

The guide could be posted online, published in Quill and provided to current and future leaders, along with the "Finances: Best Practices" guide already disseminated. Consider it FOI for SPJ, one of the basic hallmarks of this organization.

Some members might suggest these practices be made mandatory, or that certain carrots or clubs might be employed to encourage their practice. If the membership feels strongly either way about that then it can debate it further, either in Anaheim, online, or in more meetings – all conducted openly, of course!

ADDITIONAL POSSIBLE ACTIONS

In addition to the openness best practices, SPJ could take other steps to foster transparency, including:

- Survey chapter leaders via SurveyMonkey to ask them their thoughts and feedback for a) what they already do regarding these practices, b) whether they would implement any of these particular practices, and c) their feelings about the openness plan elements. Could include some other questions for them as well, relevant to the organization.
- Schedule a session at the national convention in Anaheim to allow chapter leaders to discuss the best practices, share their experiences, and provide recommendations and suggestions.
- Draft a resolution for the national convention in Anaheim regarding transparency, reinforcing our commitment to holding our government and ourselves accountable for the good of society.

Proposal

Adopt and promote the Openness and Accountability Best Practices resource guide, which follows.

Openness and Accountability Best Practices Guide

The Society of Professional Journalists and its professional and student chapters are not government entities, but members believe in the strongest principles of transparency — that the business of the members should be done before the members, inviting the members to participate. The following guidelines provide tips and recommendations for fostering openness and accountability at the local, regional and national levels of the society.

MEETINGS

SPJ meetings at the local and national level should follow the spirit of state sunshine laws (for a good description of open meeting law elements, see www.rcfp.org/ogg). Leaders should:

- Post meeting time, date, and place information in advance for members, prospective members, and the public, on a website, Facebook page, email or other accessible venue.
- Include action/discussion items in meeting agendas to increase meeting attendance and attract potential new members. Members should contact the president at least two days in advance of the meeting if they would like to request a topic for the agenda.
- Allow anyone from the membership or public to observe meetings. Provide an open comment period to let people chime in.
- Post a summary of the meeting at a chapter website promptly, preferably within five business days of the meeting, so members can keep abreast of chapter activities. Include any decisions or votes.
- Make meetings accessible, both physically and electronically. Meetings should be held where people are welcome to attend and can easily access. Consider GoToMeeting or other electronic means of broadcasting meetings and allowing participation for those cannot get to the meeting, but are interested in what happens.
- Account for circumstances where private discussion among leaders is necessary, similar to state open meeting laws. For example, typical exemptions that might allow meeting in “executive session” include considering/debating the qualifications of new leader appointees, rent negotiations for space, pending/potential litigation, etc. If board members do discuss matters in executive session, they should come out and make any decisions and votes publicly.

RECORDS AND COMMUNICATIONS

Society records and communications should be as open as possible to foster understanding, trust and efficiency. In general, just like meetings, apply the gist of state public record laws to SPJ functions, at least in spirit if not in letter.

- Make available online, if possible, and in a publicly available binder, governance documents, including bylaws, policies, annual IRS 990 forms, annual budget summaries, meeting minutes, and reports. This has the added benefit of saving institutional knowledge to be more easily passed along to new members/leaders.

- Follow the “Finances: Best Practices” recommendations at <http://www.spj.org/chapter-best-practices.asp> to prevent fraud within the organization. Provide a monthly financial report, budget, annual report and other financial information to members and the public. For extra transparency, member trust, and a barrier to malfeasance, post bank statements online as pdfs, with account numbers redacted, monthly, quarterly, or annually. If not feasible, allow members or the public to view chapter financial records by appointment.
- Provide a public forum for members to share information, discuss issues and network, such as a chapter WordPress blog, Facebook page, Twitter, or other social media venue. Use third-party software to annually archive the content of those online resources and save to a computer and binder (e.g., TwInBox, Tweetake, SocialSafe, Cloudpreservation).
- Respond promptly, ideally the same day, to any request from the media or public regarding the chapter. Provide national headquarters and other relevant leaders a heads up when SPJ might make the news. See SPJ’s Social Media Guidelines for more tips about public communication as an SPJ leader.
- Assume that chapter email communications could be made available publicly, either through leaks, inadvertent “cc’s” or even through state public record requests (some members and leaders are government employees and subject to public record laws, even when using their private emails). If you absolutely don’t want something spread through email, then it’s best to pick up the phone.
- Account for circumstances where society records and communications should be kept secret for legitimate reasons, such as personnel, potential litigation, etc. Redact exempt information if need be, such as bank account numbers and dates of birth.
- Openly disclose any potential, real or perceived conflicts of interest of chapter leaders. Document in publicly accessible documents, such as meeting minutes, to demonstrate that leaders, chapters, and the society are not hiding anything.



MEMORANDUM

DATE: April 10, 2013
FROM: Joe Skeel, Executive Director
SUBJ: Fair use guidelines
FOR: SPJ Board of Directors

SPJ was approached last spring about helping develop guidelines for Fair Use for journalists. The Executive Committee agreed that SPJ could play a role by connecting the organizers to SPJ chapters/members. And, perhaps after the guidelines were complete, SPJ could play a role in educating journalists on appropriate Fair Use.

Since initial support from the Executive Committee, Patricia Aufderheide and Peter Jaszi of American University worked to gather information – namely via 17 meetings with members from SPJ chapters. Patricia also attended EIJ12 and presented a session on Fair Use.

Following this memo is the proposed principles, based on those information-gathering sessions.

The SPJ Board of Directors is now being asked to adopt these principles as its own. As it's written, we would be considered the authors. Should the board vote in favor of doing so, the principles would be, more or less, "SPJ's Fair Use Principles."

Because the following document has been vetted by their legal advisory board, Patricia is asking for a "thumbs up or thumbs down" vote. Editing the document is not an option. Although, Patricia did say SPJ could be listed as a "signatory" or "initial endorser," as other groups have done. Our legal folks say these alternative designations would make little difference.

Below is our legal counsel's input on the proposed principles:

After reviewing the report, my recommendation is that SPJ decline to do so for the reasons outlined below. Of course, I would be happy to discuss this with the Board in greater detail or answer any questions.

There is no question that SPJ would be adopting and endorsing the principles set forth in the AU report. The document notes that it was "created by the Society [of] Professional Journalists" after it "determined the need for a set of principles" to govern fair use in the wake of other AU reports on similar topics. As I discussed with you a few months ago, we are and remain uncomfortable with SPJ endorsing a set of legal "best practices," particular in a field such as fair use that continues to be a significant battleground (especially in the online world) and continues to rapidly evolve.

First, I understand that the document notes that it is limited to seven situations that "represent the current consensus ... about acceptable practices for the fair use of

copyrighted materials,” and that it isn’t meant to be exhaustive or to limit the application of fair use outside of these situations. However, despite that statement, that’s often how “best practices” are interpreted in the courts. While a judge has no legal justification for allowing such evidence into the record, much like the SPJ Code of Ethics, it often occurs anyway. The concern is that we spend years fighting against this document’s use in copyright cases. This risk might be more palatable if we made the evaluation, as we have with the Code of Ethics, that the document’s use to journalists is worth the legal risk. But I don’t think that’s the case here.

What concerns me most is what we discussed several months ago when I first saw the AU statement of the project; that is, that fair use is such an elastic test that it cannot be boiled down to “best practices.” In our libel seminars, we are often pressed by journalists to give them hard guidelines as to what is and is not fair use. Because there are four fluid factors involved in the analysis (though the report attempts to combine those four factors in two), that is impossible to do. For example, taking 50 words from a 400-page book is much different than taking 50 words from a 200-word poem. And even then there is no bright line – the 50 words from the 400-page book might well not be a fair use if they are the “heart of the work.” We generally tell journalists to use the “Golden Rule,” i.e., take from others only that which you would wouldn’t mind taken from you.

I believe it’s dangerous to have a document out there that purports to “guide” journalists on fair use because one minor difference or factor in each unique situation – and in fair use they’re all unique – could change the legal consequences of a use. There is no substitute for individual analysis of each use of copyrighted material in context. In other words, these “best practices” could put journalists in legal jeopardy if they rely on the guidelines without appropriate consideration of the circumstances. My concern is especially strong because the “situations” and recommendations presented in this report are extraordinarily broad. Take, for example, Situation Three (“when copyrighted material is used in cultural reporting and criticism”). The document states that the use of copyrighted material in this circumstance is fair use. But it doesn’t take into account how much is used, whether it’s the “heart of the work,” or other factors that are integral to the fair use analysis. “Cultural reporting and criticism” does not create a talismanic immunity from copyright claims.

Second, some of the legal statements made in this document are too broad or flat-out wrong. For example, the document states that journalists “have a right under fair use to employ as much of a copyrighted work that they need to accomplish their goals.” This is far too broad a statement, and one that I would never advocate on SPJ’s behalf. Accepting such broad statements might be easier if copyright and fair use were a one-way street, but as we know, journalists have interests on both sides of the copyright debate. The document also states, for example, that “if a journalist receives material subject to specific restrictions on use, the journalist is bound by those restrictions.” That is incorrect. If there is an agreement the journalist may bound by the agreement under basic contract law, but even if a copyright holder withholds permission to use a work the fair use defense is still available in a copyright action.

For the reasons stated above and many more individual concerns I have with specific statements or conclusions in the document, I would recommend that SPJ decline to adopt the report or allow itself to be represented as the author of, signatory to, or driving force behind the document. I see no problem with SPJ being listed as a collaborator because of its role in opening its membership roles for research purposes, but I recommend avoiding any designation by which it appears that SPJ has endorsed the document.

I should point out, this is an ongoing effort by the folks at American University to partner with many organizations in order to clear up the concept of Fair Use in many different arenas. SPJ’s portion is isolated to journalism. Principles have already been adopted for academic and research libraries, media literacy and documentary films, to name a few. The project was funded by the McCormick Foundation, a well-known journalism supporter.

CSM LOGO (upper left)

PIJIP (upper left)

SPJ LOGO (upper right)

SET OF PRINCIPLES IN
**FAIR USE FOR
JOURNALISM**

April 2013

Society of Professional Journalists

Funded by the McCormick Foundation

Spj.org/fairuse

centerforsocialmedia.org/journalism

wcl.american.edu/pijip/

April 2013

WHAT THIS IS

This document is a statement of principles to help journalists in the United States interpret the copyright doctrine of fair use. It is intended for anyone who engages in the set of practices that entails creating media of any kind that refers to real-life events of public interest, in service of public knowledge, whether that person is a full-time professional or an individual who takes it upon himself or herself to report about specific issues or events. In other words, the definition of “journalism” to which this document speaks is defined by acts, not titles, and is an inclusive one, reflecting (in part) the changing nature of the technologies that support and enable journalistic practice.

Fair use is the right to use copyrighted material without permission or payment under some circumstances—especially when the cultural or social benefits of the use are predominant. It is a general right that applies even in situations where the law does not provide an explicit authorization for the specific use in question. As with more familiar rights of free expression, people use this right without any formal notification or registration.

This guide identifies seven situations that represent the current consensus within the community of working journalists about acceptable practices for the fair use of copyrighted materials. It identifies some common situations encountered by journalists, principles for the application of fair use in those situations, and the limitations that journalists recommend to define the zone of greatest comfort for employment of this right – all consistent with the development of the fair use doctrine in the courts.

WHAT THIS ISN'T

This set of principles does not describe the full extent of fair use rights. Instead, it describes how those rights should apply in certain common situations for journalists. The fair use rights of journalists may, of course, extend to other situations as well.

It is not a guide to using material that authors or owners give the public permission to use, such as works covered by Creative Commons licenses. Anyone can use those works the way their owners authorize—although other uses also may also be permitted under the fair use doctrine, depending on the terms of the license in question. Likewise, it is not a guide to the use of material that has been specifically licensed, which may be subject to contractual limitations, or to material that the journalist has received with permission and under some limiting terms, whether they are made orally or in writing.

It is not a guide to material that is already free to use without considering copyright. For instance, all works produced by an employee of the federal government on work time (and that include no third-party copyrighted material) are in the public domain, as are many older works. For more information on "free use," consult the document "Yes, You Can!" (centerforsocialmedia.org/files/pdf/free_use.pdf). It is also important to remember that facts are not copyrightable. Thus, journalists (and anyone else) are free to report facts first reported by others, as well as reasonable inferences others have derived from facts, though not always in the same words. In addition, headlines and many ledes are free to copy, if indeed they are simple declarations of facts.

This is not a guide to ways of using material that are without copyright consequences. For

example, current court decisions indicate that simply linking to content that is legitimately available online is an activity that copyright does not regulate.

Fair use does not apply in situations where a journalist or the journalist's organization has contracted with another organization to provide materials. In most cases, contractual agreements that require payment for use—for instance, an agreement to pay for a photograph or a video clip if a trial version has been sent, or an agreement to pay per use for an acquired news photograph, or standing contracts with providers—override otherwise valid fair use arguments.

Likewise, this document does not deal with journalists' legal responsibilities under bodies of law other than copyright, such as privacy, defamation, and national security. Nor does it address the current resurgence of interest (however well- or ill-founded) in legal regulation of the process by which journalists repeat “hot news” first reported by others.

Finally, this set of principles does not specifically address the issues raised by the 1998 Digital Millennium Copyright Act, which creates barriers to otherwise lawful fair uses of copyrighted materials that are available only in formats that incorporate technological protection measures (such as encryption), and prohibits the deletion of embedded information identifying the author or source of a document under certain circumstances.

HOW THIS DOCUMENT WAS CREATED

This set of principles was created by the Society for Professional Journalists. The Society determined the need for a set of principles after the issuing of an American University report, *Copyright, Free Speech, and the Public's Right to Know: How Journalists Think*

about Fair Use, on the problems journalists face in understanding their fair use rights.

Under the auspices of the SPJ Patricia Aufderheide and Peter Jaszi at American University, with local hosts from the Society of Professional Journalists and often with support from Online Journalism Association chapters, held 17 deliberative meetings in Washington, D.C.; Baltimore; New York; Boston; Minneapolis; Duluth, MN; Los Angeles; San Francisco; and Fort Lauderdale, where common, recurrent fair use issues in journalism were discussed in depth by small groups of experienced practitioners. These meetings guided the drafting of the set of principles. The principles were reviewed by an expert legal advisory board, whose members are listed at the end of this document.

FAIR USE

These days, copyright is ubiquitous – all kinds of new material, from the highly significant to the relatively trivial, is automatically protected upon its creation. Likewise, a wide swath of older material, dating back to 1923 or even before, is (and will for some time continue to be) subject to protection. United States law provides copyright protection to all kinds of “works of authorship,” whether deathless prose or someone’s to-do list. But this is only one aspect of copyright law, which was designed to implement government policy that fosters the creation of culture. Copying, quoting, and generally re-using existing cultural material can be, under some circumstances, a critically important part of generating new culture. In fact, the cultural value of copying is so well established that it is written into the social bargain at the heart of copyright law, as inscribed in the United States Constitution.

The bargain is this: we as a society give limited property rights to creators to encourage them to produce culture. At the same time, we give other creators the chance to use that

same copyrighted material, without permission or payment, in some circumstances.

Without the second half of the bargain, we could all lose important new cultural work.

Copyright law has several features that permit quotations from copyrighted works without permission or payment, under certain conditions. Fair use is the most important of these features. It has its origins in 18th century British law, has been an explicit part of U.S. copyright for more than 170 years, and includes elements (the right to engage in criticism and commentary, for example) that are widely recognized through the world. In the U.S., where it applies, fair use is a user's right. In fact, as the Supreme Court has pointed out (in its 2003 *Eldred* decision and the 2011 *Golan* decision), fair use helps to keep copyright from violating the First Amendment. New creation inevitably incorporates existing material. As copyright protects more works for longer periods than ever before, creators face new challenges: licenses to incorporate copyrighted sources become more expensive and more difficult to obtain—and sometimes are simply unavailable. As a result, fair use is more important today than ever before.

Copyright law does not specify exactly how to apply fair use, and that gives the fair use doctrine a flexibility that works to the advantage of users. Creative needs and practices differ with the field, with technology, and with time. Rather than following a specific formula, lawyers and judges decide whether an unlicensed use of copyrighted material is "fair" according to a "rule of reason." This means they will take all the facts and circumstances into account to decide if an unlicensed use of copyrighted material generates social or cultural benefits that ultimately are greater than the costs it imposes on the copyright owner.

Fair use is flexible—but it is not unreliable. In fact, for any particular field of critical or creative activity, lawyers and judges have long considered the shared opinions of practitioners in assessing what is "fair" within their field. In weighing the balance at the heart of fair use analysis, judges typically consider the non-exclusive list of “factors” mentioned in Section 107 of the Copyright Act: the nature of the use; the nature of the work used; the extent of the use; and its economic effect (the so-called "four factors"). This still leaves much room for interpretation, especially since the law is clear that these are not the only permissible considerations.

So how have judges interpreted fair use? In reviewing the history of contemporary fair use litigation, we find that judges return again and again to two key questions:

- Did the unlicensed use "transform" the copyrighted material by using it for a different purpose than that of the original, or did it just repeat the work for the same intent and value as the original?
- Was the material taken reasonably appropriate in kind and amount, considering the nature of the copyrighted work and of the use?

If the answers to these two questions are "yes," a court is likely to find a use fair. Because that is true, such uses often are not challenged in the first place. Many of the cases that proceed into the courtroom involve uses that test the limits of fair use, rather than ones within the large field of common fair use practice

Both key questions touch on, among other things, the question of whether the use will

cause excessive economic harm to the copyright owner. Courts have told us that copyright owners are not entitled to an absolute monopoly over transformative uses of their works. By the same token, however, when a use supplants a copyright owner's core market, it is unlikely to be fair. For example, a journalist cannot reproduce large parts of a competitor's article merely to avoid the trouble of doing her own reporting. Another consideration may influence the way in which these questions are analyzed in practice: Whether the user acted reasonably and in good faith, in light of general practice in his or her particular field. The fact that community practice influences judicial decisions makes it important for communities of practice to understand and articulate their fair use rights.

Many of the most common journalistic activities in which quoting, reproducing, or referencing copyrighted material occurs are self-evidently transformative, when done in a responsible and professional manner. This is true whether the journalist is working in print, audio, video, or online; fair use is not medium-specific. Likewise, the principles of fair use apply equally to a newspaper article, a piece of music, a film, a user's tweet, and a website. However, since all fair use instances are context-dependent and case-by-case, potential fair users of copyrighted material should weigh all the circumstances in making a decision about how to proceed.

JOURNALISTS AND FAIR USE

Journalists have long depended upon the right of fair use to incorporate copyrighted material into their work, and to this day, they do so constantly. Journalists use it, often without thinking about it or even knowing they are doing so, to quote or paraphrase source material, to provide proof or illustration of assertions, and to engage in comment or critique, among other uses. Indeed, the business of journalism is sustained in part by fair

use, which enables appropriate, timely, unlicensed quotations and references to newsworthy material.

Fair use protects journalists' free speech rights from within the structure of copyright. Those rights fuel journalists' mission to inform the public. This mission has a far-reaching effect; journalists play a key part in shaping the way members of a society understand the actions and motives of others – and sometimes of themselves. This self-understanding is generated not only by the headline news of the day and hard-hitting investigative reporting of government malfeasance, but by cultural criticism, editorial writing, sports reporting, beat, and community reporting.

Journalists' fair use rights are particularly favored in U.S. copyright law. Criticism, comment and news reporting are all singled out in the law as specific examples of general purposes appropriate for fair use. But whether specific instances constitute fair use must be determined on a case-by-case basis.

For many years, journalistic practice on fair use was established by journalists' newsroom conventions, often grounded in advice from manuals previously vetted by company lawyers, and on the occasional visit to their institution's lawyers. Increasingly, journalists, particularly those who work outside of large media organizations, find themselves unsure about their right to quote copyrighted material, particularly in newer, digital formats and in social media. As *Copyright, Free Speech, and the Public's Right to Know* documented, the most common consequences of such insecurity are delay, higher costs, and failure to publish and innovate.

Journalists recognize that copying is central to their work. Responsible aggregation is a key and perennial feature of journalism; journalists always have “advanced the story” by building upon the work of other journalists, whether through attributed quotation or unattributed reference. Of course, much common journalistic copying does not even require fair use, since facts themselves are not copyrightable. Often, however, bare facts are not enough; the very words or images through which information is expressed may be part of the story. Thus, in practice, much journalistic copying and follow-on work has always (if sometimes unknowingly) depended on fair use.

However, the rise of journalistic enterprises that embrace aggregation as a business model has created a heightened awareness, and sometimes alarm, about copying and sharing of journalistic work. This document will help journalists understand what is acceptable copying, and what the journalistic community, with expert legal advice, believes goes beyond fair use.

Journalists’ commonly-held understandings, as documented in the Statement, are drawn from their collective experience and supported by legal analysis. This set of principles will enhance capacity to employ fair use, both for journalists and for their various gatekeepers, including editors, publishers, insurers and lawyers, who determine whether and in what form the work of journalists reaches the public. Thus, this set of principles helps to show that the uses of copyrighted materials described here are reasonable and appropriate for the purposes of journalism.

Fair use is in wide and vigorous use today in many professional communities beyond journalism. Some of these other professional communities have also set forth their

understandings in consensus documents, including the 2005 *Documentary Filmmakers' Statement of Best Practices in Fair Use*, which may be useful to some journalists. All these documents are available at centerforsocialmedia.org/fair-use. Although professional groups typically create such documents, no one needs to be a member of a professional group to benefit from their interpretations.

GENERAL POINTS ABOUT PRINCIPLES AND VALUES

These principles apply to all forms of media. In all cases, a digital copy is the same as a hard copy in terms of fair use, and an on-line use (unless otherwise noted) is equivalent to an off-line one. Text, photography, music, and video are all equally eligible for fair use.

These principles apply to situations in which a journalist has unconditioned access to material, regardless of the source. When a user has obtained a copy illegally, however, that may affect fair use analysis. Further, in situations where there is only one source of the material (as may be true of some archival items), the holder of the material may impose the conditions he/she chooses, and fair use will yield to them. If a journalist receives material subject to specific restrictions on use, the journalist is bound by those restrictions.

The principles are all subject to a "rule of proportionality." Journalists have a right under fair use to employ as much of a copyrighted work that they need to accomplish their goals—and sometimes even to use an entire work – a photograph, or a critical source document, for example. By the same token, the fairness of a use depends, in part, on whether the user took only what was reasonably appropriate to accomplish his or her legitimate purpose. Journalists thus cannot reliably use numerical rules of thumb in making

this determination.

Journalists share values that shape their expectations for fair use of others' copyrighted material. Attribution is a highly prized journalistic value, though not one that features significantly in the U.S. copyright law (unlike that of other countries). Merely identifying the source material does not make an otherwise unjustified use "fair" nor does the law literally require that uses be accompanied by attribution in order to be considered fair. However, journalists believe strongly that there is an ethical and academic imperative to provide proper attribution. And, obviously, if it is important to use specific copyrighted content in a particular piece of journalism, appropriate citation helps make that justification more apparent. At the same time, journalists appreciate that the form and content of an appropriate attribution will vary by medium and context. And of course, journalists may wish to use works for which full attribution cannot be provided (because of a promise of confidentiality, for example, or because the information is not discoverable).

Journalists also share the strong value that when copyrighted material has been prepared, even indirectly, with taxpayer money, the journalist's responsibility and the fair use claim on the material are both increased. The public's investment in the original material correspondingly emphasizes the public's right to know.

Journalists also value the importance of honoring each other's work not only with attribution but, where possible and appropriate, with payment. Particularly in dealing with work that comes from war zones or other areas of difficult and dangerous access, they highly value their colleagues' contribution to the mission to inform the public. While this value does not override either the ability or will to employ fair use where appropriate, it

may sometimes color journalists' decisions on whether to employ their fair use right.

Journalists recognize the importance of timeliness, which is part of the core mission of journalism. They respect the importance of deadlines not merely for their business model but to meet the mission of informing the public in a timely way. This is particularly true for issues of public safety, public health, and fast-moving news of universal interest and impact. Therefore, journalists consider the issue of timeliness in relation to public importance as well in making their fair use decisions. Consideration of the urgency of the public's need to know may influence not only a decision to fairly use material; it may also affect how much material is taken. By the same token, however, journalists understand that merely beating the competition to a story should not, in itself, a justification for violating the copyrights of third parties. The Principles and Limitations below represent, among other things, a balancing of sometimes conflicting journalistic imperatives.

In general, the Principles and Limitations below apply with equal force to all kinds of source material, from cell phone videos of a war zone to routine coverage of a political campaign. In specific instances, of course, they will apply differently depending on how the considerations they detail play out in specific journalistic contexts.

PRINCIPLES IN FAIR USE FOR JOURNALISM

SITUATION ONE: Incorporation of copyrighted material captured incidentally and fortuitously in the process of recording and disseminating news. Journalists report on a modern reality permeated with copyrighted content. They constantly capture such material incidentally in the course of reporting on specific events and activities. This is not material

they have chosen to include for its own sake; rather, it is an inseparable part of the reality they seek to portray. Excluding (or drastically curtailing) the amount of such material contained in reporting would compromise the truth-telling mission of journalism.

PRINCIPLE: Fair use applies to the incidental and fortuitous capture of copyright material in journalism.

LIMITATIONS:

--Fair use does not apply where a journalist has gained access to a person or place by agreeing, either orally or in writing, to forego specific uses of the material gathered as a result.

--Neither does it apply if a journalist inserts copyrighted material into the reality being recorded and disseminated, as by asking musicians playing at an event to perform a particular song, or distorts news choices in order to include copyrighted material.

--The journalist should not repurpose incidentally captured material—for instance, a popular song sung by a celebrity at an event—for aesthetic or entertainment purposes, whether elsewhere in the same piece or in other work.

-- The journalist should attribute the material in a reasonable manner. Where relevant, attribution should extend to entities or individuals other than copyright owners (e.g., the art gallery where a picture is hanging or the performer who interprets a song at a public event).

SITUATION TWO: Use of copyrighted material as proof or substantiation in news reporting or analysis. Journalists routinely include copyrighted material, whether from a report, a memo, a video, or a photograph, and whether informally generated in social media or through traditional media channels, as evidence of their claim that something did or did

not happen, or to support (or negate) the assertions of a source or other newsworthy person.

PRINCIPLE: Fair use applies when journalists use copyrighted material as documentation, to validate, prove, support, or document a proposition.

LIMITATIONS:

--The journalist should take as much as is reasonably appropriate to enable the news consumer to assess validity of a journalist's assertions and interpretations.

--The journalist should consider the value of the copyrighted material to the public's understanding of and confidence in the reporting.

--The journalist should attribute the material in a reasonable manner.

SITUATION THREE: When copyrighted material is used in cultural reporting and criticism. Journalists quote elements from movies, songs, books, articles, blog posts, exhibit displays, online videos, images circulated in social media, and other copyrighted material, in the course of reporting on cultural phenomena, and in reviewing and commenting on cultural products, events, and expression. Journalists employ copyrighted material both in referring to the existence of phenomena and in developing arguments about them. Journalistic reporting, comment and criticism on cultural expression is a critically important part of the circulation of culture in a society. In order to do that work, journalists need to be able to reference and quote the material they discuss, making their selections and forming their commentary without the permission of the owners of the work.

PRINCIPLE: The use of textual, visual and other quotations of cultural material for

purposes of reporting, criticism, commentary, or discussion constitutes fair use.

LIMITATIONS:

- The journalist should take as much as is reasonably appropriate to enable the news consumer to understand the point being made.
- The journalist should contextualize the material to make clear its relevance to the current work.
- The journalist should make the connection between the cultural criticism or commentary and the selection of copyrighted material clear to the news consumers, by means of text references, captions, voice-over, or other signaling.
- The journalist should honor any promises that he or she has affirmatively made to the provider of copyrighted cultural material (such as video clips from new movies).
- The journalist should attribute the material in a reasonable manner.

SITUATION FOUR: When copyrighted material is used as illustration in news reporting or analysis. Journalists use copyrighted material to illustrate as well as provide proof of a story. They may include a photograph from an event, include quotations from people attending an event, or provide an audio sound portrait from an event, among many other uses of illustration. Illustration in reporting is not merely decorative. It serves a news function by adding information and context otherwise either not available or provided in a much less efficient or effective way.

PRINCIPLE: Fair use applies to illustration in news reporting.

LIMITATIONS:

- The illustration should add meaningfully to the audience's understanding of the facts or

issues.

--The amount employed should be reasonably appropriate to the illustrative purpose.

--When the illustrative material is provided by a business that provides material primarily designed to illustrate current events, such as a syndicated news service, and the use is for reporting on current events, the journalist should purchase the material.

--The journalist should attribute the material in a reasonable manner.

SITUATION FIVE: When copyrighted material is used as historical reference in news reporting or analysis. Journalists often make reference to previous events, to people in earlier situations, to previously existing structures, and to other historical items in the process of reporting or commenting on the news. Historical contextualizing is an important aspect of the work of reporting and analysis. Journalists not only share facts with their users, but help them to understand the meaning of those facts. Arts journalists often need to compare current work to earlier work, or provide a meaningful comparison with others' work to situate creative effort within a tradition or a trend.

PRINCIPLE: Fair use applies to journalistic incorporation of historical material.

LIMITATIONS:

--The journalist should contextualize the historical material to make clear its relevance to the current work.

--The journalist should take an appropriate amount that will provide the relevant historical context.

--The journalist should attribute the material in a reasonable manner.

SITUATION SIX: Using copyrighted material for the specific purpose of starting or expanding a public discussion of news. Sometimes journalists make available to users copyrighted material garnered in the process of news reporting or analysis, to enrich discussion about the public significance of that material. Increasingly, journalists enlist members of the news-consuming public to participate in news generation -- through “crowdsourcing” techniques, for example. Such practices must function, of course, as an adjunct to a journalist’s reporting, editorializing, analysis or critique, rather than as a substitute for it. But now that it is more possible than ever before to tap into expertise distributed throughout the populace, it is part of the journalist’s mission not only to deliver information, but to share, responsibly and appropriately, underlying documentation that can deepen the understanding of news.

PRINCIPLE: The use of copyrighted material to promote public discussion and analysis can qualify as fair use.

LIMITATIONS:

- The journalist should make clear to news consumers why the material is being made available, and what kinds of responses it is intended to elicit – for example, critical commentary, analysis, new contextual information, or follow-on reporting of additional facts.
- The journalist should use as much material as is appropriate to provide news consumers with an opportunity to engage productively with the material.
- Where linking to the material is an alternative compatible with the journalist’s objectives, it should be preferred to copying.
- The journalist (or outlet) should make available tools and forums designed to encourage

participation by news consumers.

--The journalist should make efforts to use the ensuing discussion or other contributions to further generate news.

--The journalist should attribute the material in a reasonable manner.

SITUATION SEVEN: Quoting from copyrighted material to add value and knowledge to evolving news. Journalists constantly derive knowledge from earlier journalism as they advance the story, contributing new information while summarizing or quoting from what is already known. Although some of this aggregation merely consolidates non-copyrightable facts, some takes verbatim excerpts of copyrighted material reporting facts or opinions. When done in ways that conform to the journalistic mission, uses of this kind recontextualize the excerpted material. Such recontextualization can be transformative, making the quotation a fair use in some circumstances.

PRINCIPLE: Fair use can apply to the quotation of earlier journalism.

LIMITATIONS:

--The journalist should make clear what she or he is adding to the existing work.

--Reviews of preexisting reports on a story or issue should where possible incorporate excerpts from multiple sources.

--The excerpts should be as brief as is reasonably appropriate to the journalist's objectives, and, in any event, not be so extensive that they effectively replicate the original stories or function as a consumer substitute for them.

--The journalist should attribute the material in a reasonable manner. Attribution should be clearly apparent to the reader or viewer, and it should be possible for that individual to

navigate easily to the original source.

-- Any contractual restrictions that the journalist agreed in receiving the material would apply to quotation from it should be observed.

COORDINATORS

Professor Peter Jaszi co-founded the Program on Information Justice and Intellectual Property, which promotes social justice in law governing information dissemination and intellectual property through research, scholarship, public events, advocacy, and provision of legal and consulting services. The program is a project of the Washington College of Law at American University in Washington, D.C.

Professor Patricia Aufderheide founded and directs the Center for Social Media, which showcases and analyzes media for social justice, civil society and democracy, and the public environment that nurtures them. The center is a project of the School of Communication, at American University in Washington, D.C.

LEGAL ADVISORY BOARD:

Jamie B. Bischoff, Esq.
Ballard Spahr, LLP
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

Michael Donaldson, Esq.
Donaldson & Callif
Los Angeles, California

Anthony Falzone, Esq.
Deputy General Counsel, Pinterest, Inc.
San Francisco, California

Prof. Jack I. Lerner
USC Gould School of Law and Annenberg School of Journalism
Los Angeles, California

Prof. Michael J. Madison
University of Pittsburgh School of Law
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania

THANK YOU

Thank you to the many journalists who took precious time to participate in this process; to Society for Professional Journalists Executive Director Chris Vachon and board member Kevin Z. Smith from the Society of Professional Journalists, for support throughout the process; to Janet Liao and Mark Hallett of the McCormick Foundation for financial support and commitment to the project and the concept; to Prof. Jennifer Urban of University of California Berkeley School of Law and to Dan Satorius, Esq., for hosting sessions; to Angelica Das, the project manager; to our graduate fellows including Bryan Bello, Katie Bieze, and Jan Lauren Boyles; and to Center for Social Media intern Miles Zinni.

Feel free to reproduce this work in its entirety. For excerpts and quotations, depend upon the principles of fair use.

spj.org/fairuse

centerforsocialmedia.org/journalism

wcl.american.edu/pijip/

BACK COVER:

CSM upper left

SPJ LOGO upper right

PIJIP lower right

spj.org/fairuse

centerforsocialmedia.org/journalism

wcl.american.edu/pijip/



MEMORANDUM

DATE: April 20, 2013
FROM: Steve Geimann
SUBJ: Accrediting Council on Education in Journalism and Mass
Communications: Spring 2013 Report
FOR: SPJ Board of Directors

The Accrediting Council will consider recommendations that for the first time would let programs with unresolved deficiencies retain their status. The Council, which meets in Phoenix May 3, also will consider initial accreditation for the University of Puerto Rico-Arecibo and Qatar University. Both had their requests advanced by site-teams. The Council will review 17 undergraduate and two graduate programs, with recommendations that programs at East Tennessee State and Abilene Christian be given two years to correct deficiencies.

The School of Mass Communications at South Florida - Tampa abruptly withdrew its application for re-accreditation two days before a mid-level review committee met to consider recommendations from teams visiting the schools.

DEFICIENCIES AFTER REVISIT

The Council's six-year review is based on a program's self-study and the views of a team that visits campus. Programs deficient on multiple standards are usually given two years to remedy the weaknesses before a revisit. So-called provisional accreditation ends with a decision of full reaccreditation, after deficiencies are removed, or denial.

Norfolk State and Southeast Missouri State, both on provisional status since 2011, remained out of compliance on assessing learning outcomes, a standard that has been in place for a decade. At Norfolk, the program "has made great strides" since the previous visit and "is going to be in compliance in the future," according to a report at the Committee meeting March 16 in Chicago. Southeast Missouri is "not quite there yet," although the "future of assessment is strong."

The site-visit teams and the Committee endorsed, without opposition, recommendations to fully reaccredit both programs with the continuing assessment deficiencies.

In both cases, the units failed to meet requirements for multi-year assessment, which requires schools to review what students learn by identifying measures, direct and indirect, to track student performance. When shortcomings are identified, the program must adjust to eliminate a weakness. A full cycle can take two to four years, depending on the program.

Leaders of the teams that revisited the schools expressed confidence the programs, which out of compliance on standard today, would by the review in four years be in full compliance.

At Colorado, the School of Journalism and Mass Communications in 2012 was “discontinued,” a bureaucratic device that let the university make changes without regard to tenure or other contract provisions. Instead, journalism at Colorado now is offered only as a dual major. This would conflict with the Council’s policy of granting status of a college, school or department that has sufficient autonomy to set the curriculum with the freedom to act as a faculty and confer degrees.

The Colorado program has been pared down. Yet, the Committee, evaluating a revisit report, agreed education was being provided to students and granted full reaccreditation through 2016. The vote to reaccredit Colorado wasn’t unanimous, and the Council probably will engage in a vigorous debate on the decision. Colorado’s graduate program also was recommended for full accreditation.

East Tennessee State, seeking reaccreditation, was non-compliant on three of nine standards -- mission and governance, diversity, and assessment, reflecting leadership turmoil in the past six years. A new president, provost and director arrived since the previous accreditation visit. During the transition, the unit failed to meet requirements in the governance standard, including maintaining a strategic plan; was unable to make progress on diversity, resulting in an all-white faculty and adjuncts; and an assessment plan was waylaid by leadership turnover.

Since the site team visited in November, the unit reports progress to correct two of three weaknesses, although diversity remains weak. A veteran Committee member said the school’s leadership, in a January written response reviewed by the Committee, seems to want to “set aside what was said in the report” prepared by the team visiting the campus after reviewing a voluminous self-study document.

The Committee debated recommending denial of reaccreditation for East Tennessee then voted 7-4 for provisional reaccreditation. The Council will consider the debate, and the unusual step that abandoned a process tied to what was in place at the time of the visit in favor of promises made by the administration.

SOUTH FLORIDA - TAMPA

South Florida-Tampa severed itself from accreditation after a team found the program out of compliance on governance and assessment. Arts and Sciences Dean Eric Eisenberg made the decision, then told students on spring break that “exciting new changes” were ahead. The announcement was made less than 70 hours before the Committee’s meeting.

Eisenberg also dismissed Gil Thelen, former editor of The Tampa Tribune, who had been hired as interim director and at the time was in negotiations on a new contract. He will be replaced by the head of the School of Information.

A story in The Oracle, the South Florida campus newspaper, quotes Eisenberg saying journalism “seems like it’s changing so fast ... you blink, and like two years later, all the things you thought

are going to be useful, aren't anymore." Eisenberg said the review by the Council site-visit team prompted him to think of "another path" for USF and he concluded "interdisciplinary innovation is our thing," according to the newspaper.

In my 15 years on the Council, no school has pulled out of the review so late in the process. Typically schools let their status lapse or decline to renew the process after six years. The South Florida St. Petersburg campus, which has a separate accredited program, retains its status.

ACCREDITING RECOMMENDATIONS

The Council in Phoenix will consider full reaccreditation for St. Cloud State, Colorado, Norfolk State, Southeast Missouri and Iowa -- all of which were on provisional. Shippensburg won a recommendation for initial accreditation after two years on provisional status.

Abilene Christian in Texas, which was deficient on the diversity standard, and East Tennessee which was out of compliance on three standards, were recommended for provisional reaccreditation.

Full reaccreditation will be considered for Arecibo in Puerto Rico, Columbia's graduate program, Illinois, Memphis, Minnesota, Ohio, Penn State, Savannah State and Washington and Lee. Qatar University's initial accreditation was endorsed, which if ratified by the Council would make it the second international school evaluated by the Council.

ACCREDITORS ACCREDITATION

The Council, which is among 60 institutional or program accrediting bodies overseen by the Council for Higher Education Accreditation, will have its application for recognition considered in November. The Council must show that accredited programs publish information on their performance, including student achievement. The Washington-based higher education group also asked the Council for information on accreditation actions when a program is out of compliance on one or more of the nine standards.

In addition, in response to the Council's require to change its scope, to reflect the international activities, CHEA asked for clarification on the process involved in evaluating international programs.

FOUR SCHOOLS SEEK INITIAL REVIEW

The Council in 2013-2014 will conduct initial reviews of the School of Journalism and Mass Media at the University of Idaho, the City University of New York Graduate School of Journalism, the School of Mass Communication at Loyola University New Orleans and the School of Information and Communication Studies at the University of Monterrey, Mexico. Monterrey would be the third international accredited program, after Qatar and Pontificia Universidad Catolica de Chile in Santiago.

ACEJMC meets in spring to review and accredit programs for six years and in late summer to discuss policies and issues. Each year, teams of educators and practitioners visit schools. A committee meets in March to review team reports and makes recommendations to the full council A Council seat costs \$3,000 a year. School annual dues are \$1,000.

I visited the University of Memphis last fall with four educators. I join a site-visit team at least once a year, and have visited 18 schools in 13 states while on the Council, including a previous visit to Memphis in 2000.

The Council, founded in 1945, accredits 110 journalism, public relations, advertising or telecommunications programs, with 11 industry and six educational groups. The minority journalism groups -- Asian American Journalists Association, National Association of Black Journalists and National Association of Hispanic Journalists -- returned to the Council this year. SPJ joined in 1977, withdrew in 1989, and returned in May 1996. After 15 years, I am among the senior Council members.



MEMORANDUM

DATE: April 8, 2013
FROM: Sue Kopen Katcef
SUBJ: Report of the Awards & Honors Committee
FOR: SPJ Board of Directors

We did a little tweaking of the Mark of Excellence and Sigma Delta Chi contests for the just-ended contest season. But it was only the start. Currently, the overall committee has been divided into two subcommittees: one to review the Mark of Excellence Contest and the other to review the Sigma Delta Chi contest.

In consultation with President Albarado, I presented the subcommittees with an outline of what I wanted them to consider during their work. That included (but was not limited to) the following:

1. Recommend changes, additions, deletion, mergers/contractions of categories (giving special consideration to adding new categories for digital & mobile media/journalism); however, should you **add** a category, one should be **removed or merged** in order to make room (judges are hard enough to find as it is for all of the categories);
2. Consider recommendations for cross-platforms: should all text, broadcast stories, regardless of where they appear (online, in print, on air) be judged together or should they remain in separate categories?
3. Determine whether the descriptions of the categories are still appropriate or are they in need of revisions;
4. **SPECIAL NOTE FOR THE SDX PANEL:** The RESEARCH category currently states that (1) broadcast programs are not eligible and (2) no electronic entries will be accepted in the category. That clearly needs to be changed.

I also established a timeline for the committees and followed up with the chairs via email several times to try the subcommittees on task. Our ultimate goal is to have recommendations for revisions to both contests to present to the FULL Awards & Honors Committee by the end of May/early June so that we'll have ample time to review them before we meet at the convention to make final recommendations that can be implemented for the next awards season.

However, there have been a few hurdles along the way. The chair of the MOE subcommittee stepped down because of some personal challenges. I'm in the process of trying to line up a new co-chair.

I had requested a progress report from both subcommittees by March 29 but received only a partial report from one of the committees. The next update is due by April 26. I am continuing to work with Lauren Rochester to move the subcommittees forward.



MEMORANDUM

DATE: April 2, 2013
FROM: Lauren Bartlett, Communications Committee Chairwoman
SUBJ: Communications Committee report
FOR: SPJ Board of Directors

The Communications Committee has been involved in a variety of activities the first half of the year.

The committee wrote talking points for the national officers to use at spring conference around the country so that all members received the same information about national issues.

The committee, partnering with headquarters staff, developed a list of SPJ experts to proactively pitch to news outlets for stories on key journalism issues to help make SPJ the voice for journalists. The program was rolled out at the beginning of the year.

As you know, last year the committee received a \$3,000 grant from SPJ, and a matching \$3,000 from the SDX Foundation for *Fighting for Your Right to Know, One Story at a Time*, a national public service announcement campaign to raise public awareness that journalists are the watchdogs for the public and bring them the information they need to know, and the Society of Professional Journalists is the citizens' advocate for open government. The plan was to produce 60-second broadcast-quality video and audio PSAs. The committee member who volunteered for this project and has the background to execute it was unavailable last year because of health issues. Numerous times since the beginning of the SPJ year (convention in Ft. Lauderdale) she has committed to moving forward with the project. However, whenever I have checked in, asked for a progress report, etc., I haven't received an answer showing any progress on the project. I gave her a June due date for the project. If the project isn't well under way by June, I will cancel it.

Last year, the committee sought and received approval from the Executive Committee to write a strategic communications plan. The goal is to project the Society of Professional Journalists as THE advocate for the public in open government discussions and use this messaging platform to promote membership in the Society. The strategy is to use chapter and national leaders and headquarters communications staff to identify open government issues on a local level where SPJ can make an impact and respond thoughtfully but quickly to these instances by creating and maintaining template statements on typical issues that need to be addressed. These templates will be created in the second half of the year.

SPJ President Sonny Albarado asked the committee to create questions for a poll to help SPJ officers in determining where to focus membership and other outreach efforts. The poll questions have been sent to Sonny.

In the second half of the year, the committee also will be exploring the idea of bringing back an old campaign: “If the press didn’t tell you, who would...” It was done in collaboration with the Ad Council. Bill McCloskey reached out to the person who had developed the campaign, who gave us the green light to move forward with the idea. We have reached out to headquarters staff to find the old material and will review and brainstorm ideas to see what would work now.



MEMORANDUM

DATE: April 2, 2013
FROM: Sandra Gonzalez, Diversity Committee Chair
SUBJ: Diversity Committee report
FOR: SPJ Board of Directors

The committee maintains its commitment to welcoming and fostering diversity into SPJ, especially into leadership roles; and to make appropriate decisions as it pertains to presentation of news and coverage of issues in changing communities.

I am a new chairman, plucked from last fall's batch of Diversity fellows, and agreed to this position. We also have a new complexion to our committee as many have left and we have gained some new faces. This is a year of transition.

- 1. Evaluating the Diversity Fellowship Program:** With a chance to get back to our newsrooms and reflect how the program went in September, we regrouped with our first committee meeting via conference call in December. We discussed successes and areas perhaps that needed improvement. As a new former fellow, and the new involvement of "fellow" fellow Sherri Williams, we have been discussing her diversity fellowship project which involves creating a survey to disseminate to former fellows from years past to get their feedback as we venture into the future. We want to retain communication with our fellows and track their progress in the industry. That seems to be one area of needed improvement is maintaining the connection. We are not quite sure what the solution is, because the mentors can only commit so much time as journalism and life can be quite demanding, especially in a "do more with less" world. That survey should be finished and distributed sometime later this month.
- 2. Maintaining contact with Diversity Mentors:** Again, just making sure the fellows are working on their projects and we will be meeting soon to hear progress on the rest of the fellows. While we have some odd situations with me and Sherri, the other fellows can be monitored following protocol. SPJ Headquarters and Sonny Albarado can maintain progress on Sherri and I. I too will be making friendly reminder calls to mentors.
- 3. Updating and Maintaining Diversity Sourcebook:** Sally Lehrman has been championing this project, and it is a wealth of information. However because of the scope of this project and the ever changing job migration of people, it is quite a task to keep updated. Sally and committee members have been discussing ideas, challenges and ways to keep this current and efficient. One way is perhaps involving other media organizations or

universities. These are just discussions. We are also considering ways to let people know it exists so it can be utilized. Again, it is a wealth of information.

4. **Social Media:** We have been active in maintaining and promoting diversity in the news industry through a Facebook page I helped to create last year: **SPJ Diversity Now**. While I work long hours as reporter in Las Vegas, I try to post stories, blogs or information of interest pertaining to diversity in news. There are other SPJ members who also post. We are trying to make that grow and would like to start a Twitter account for those who don't do Facebook to have access to the same information. Please check it out.
5. **Blogs and articles:** The Diversity committee has contributed 2 articles to the "**Quill**" since the last two editions. I wrote one about diversifying coverage of holiday events focusing on the Latino tradition of "Posadas" with some help from committee member Jeremy Steele. Sherri Williams contributed an article about Black History Month focusing on just who is African American, and how the United States is bringing in lots of immigrants from Africa. On our **Who's News Diversity Blog**, we have contributed two articles. There should be more, but we had a hiccup in commitment that we are trying to remedy. In the meantime, I posted the Q&A with Sonny Albarado and his commitment to diversity. And Tracy Everbach has stepped to plate to get the blog rolling for Women's History Month on women not being used much for sources as experts. We will be getting more traffic up there as I have one coming up on civil rights and probably one very soon on the use of "illegal immigrant".
6. **EIJ 2013 Diversity Fellowship Planning:** Chris Vachon so graciously got me up to speed recently on what is being done. I checked out the draft plan for funding and it was well written and should it get approved, there are plans being made for the next batch of diversity fellows. We are very excited about SPJ's partnership with **NAHJ** which is like a second family to me. This will be a historic year in Anaheim. We have come up with some tentative names of leaders of diverse backgrounds in the industry we would like to speak to fellows, and the exposure to NAHJ members and panels will be perfect for the mission of SPJ Diversity. Also, thanks to the teamwork of the committee, we have also submitted an idea for a workshop that we hope will be approved for Census and computer assisted reporting combined. We know of experts in these arenas would be excellent to train journalists how to blend these numbers and techniques to come up with good stories, especially as our country continues to change its complexion and population.
7. **New America Award:** SPJ Diversity will be involved with judging this award that honors public service journalism that explores and exposes an issue of importance to ethnic and immigrant communities currently living in the U.S. SPJ Diversity committee member Rebecca Tallent will be assisting with me on this as well.
8. **Regional SPJ outreach:** we encourage outreach of diversity to local chapters. I will be attending our regional conference in Las Vegas. I will be meeting a mentee, and she will be bringing college students from my alma mater Cal State Fullerton. There will be double mentorship happening. I consistently carry the mission of diversity in news wherever I go, and reach out. I am representing SPJ as secretary in our Las Vegas Chapter which is hosting the regional conference. I have confidence our other members are doing the same in their

sphere of influence whether it's in a newsroom, in the classroom, or at a journalism conference.



SINCE 1909

THE NATIONAL JOURNALISM CENTER

3909 N. MERIDIAN ST.

INDIANAPOLIS, IND. 46208

317-927-8000

FAX: 317-920-4789

SPJ@SPJ.ORG

WWW.SPJ.ORG

MEMORANDUM

DATE: April 2, 2013
FROM: Kevin Smith, Ethics Committee Chair
SUBJ: Ethics Committee report
FOR: SPJ Board of Directors

ETHICS BOOK – The book continues to gain in academic popularity. We added four new universities to the list from last fall. That brings us up to about 18 schools using the book. This is a fluid list because of class scheduling and changes in professors. Someone may use it for an ethics class that is held once a year or on a longer cycle.

However, plans are initially under way for a new edition. Fred Brown has been talking with Jim Schuette of Marion Street Press about adding new case studies and releasing a new version next spring in time for book orders and consideration in the fall of 2014.

ETHIC CODE – As time advances and more of more of it is placed between the current code, created in 1996 and now, the questions about revising the code continue to arise. The questions and the suggestions are hard to ignore. This has always sparked a heated debate as to whether there needs to be revisions to adjust for the state of journalism.

On one hand, the point is made that the code should be changed with every technological or philosophical change, otherwise we'd be changing the code repeatedly. That makes sense that our principles remain constant even when journalism does not.

The other side of the argument suggested that the code has some noticeable flaws in that it dates itself with language about print and broadcast but never mentions digital or social media. This is more glaring to the younger generation of journalists who know that far better than print axioms.

While there is no consensus at this point, even on the committee, it's my opinion as chair these last three years that we need to make an earnest effort to vet this once and for all and to stop ignoring that the debate would be healthy and progressive for the Society.

POSITION PAPERS – The committee has stopped writing these. We have four that were completed last year and we haven't had those posted on the website to date and until the work has been caught up, we will focus our attention elsewhere.

ETHICS GRANT – The committee submitted a grant request to SDX in the amount of \$3,000 to conduct site research in Aurora, Colo. following the theater shooting in 2012. Over the years case studies tend to be

constructed from facts derived almost exclusively from the media itself. Usually the media gains the basic information and then applies ethical suppositions in order to create the case as a teaching moment. Rarely, (we can't find incidents of this) does the media actually gain perspectives from the people who are affected, unless they bring a suit.

Our intention is to work with DART and spend some time later this year interviewing families, friends and community members/leaders about the media's handling of the situation from the night to the end to the trial. We hope to then apply that information toward creating ethics training sessions at national convention, regional conferences or for chapter programs.

HOTLINE – We continue to answer ethical inquiries that come in via the Ethics Hotline or by email or phone calls directly to Kevin Smith and Fred Brown. We are averaging about five per week, more at midterm or the end of the semester when ethics classes need to turn in research papers. We are on par to manage over 300 calls again this year.

CONFERENCES/REGIONALS – Ethics training continues at national conferences and SPJ regionals. On April 6, President-Elect David Cuillier took part on a plagiarism panel at the American Copy Editors' Society's national convention in St. Louis. Ethics Committee member Mike Farrell was appointed to a committee to draft a definition of plagiarism and was slated served at the conference as SPJ's representative on the issue.

In Region 4, me and Hagit Limor were part of a panel discussing social media ethics on April 6. In Region 5/7, Elizabeth Donald is scheduled to be part of a session on basic newsroom ethics.



MEMORANDUM

DATE: April 9, 2013
FROM: Rebecca Tallent, Journalism Education Chair
SUBJ: Journalism Education Committee report
FOR: SPJ Board of Directors

During the 2012-13 year, the Journalism Education Committee focused primarily on the state of high school journalism project. Lee Anne Peck from the University of Northern Colorado and I spent the summer of 2012 developing an outline for the two-year project and finding resources for members to use, compiling it all into an annotated bibliography.

The committee spent much of its time helping to write grants for the project and selecting which parts of the project they wanted to write, develop or edit. The project is now divided into various components with most of the committee members writing historical sections, working on the survey that will be distributed to high school journalism teachers and school administrators next fall, continuing grant work or preparing for editing the materials as they are submitted by members. Specifically The sections for the project are:

- Historical
 - Pre-1960
 - 1960-Hazelwood
 - Post Hazelwood
- High school journalism workshops
- How journalism teaches critical thinking
- The relationship between journalists and high school programs
- Next step: Action programs

The committee agreed that although everything will be compiled into one report, members may use their sections for AEJMC papers to help with their own tenure or promotion process. The timeline calls for the final report to be completed by July 1, 2014; both Lee Anne and I will be taking sabbaticals in spring 2014 to compile and edit the final report.

In addition the committee has worked to develop articles and toolboxes for Quill and suggested a session for the EIJ Conference in August 2013 about the high school study, which was not successful; but we do hope to be able to present our findings at the 2014 conference.

While this report is short, I can assure you the work of the J-Ed Committee is long and involved in this major project. We are committed to completing the work, which is a follow-up to the Captive Voices report of 40 years ago and the Death by Cheeseburgers report of 20 years ago. If you have any questions concerning our work, please feel free to contact me.



MEMORANDUM

DATE: April 9, 2013
FROM: Linda Petersen, FOI Committee Chair
SUBJ: FOI Committee report
FOR: SPJ Board of Directors

BLACK HOLE AWARD

The winner of this year's award was Oklahoma State University for, among other things, ignoring the Clery Act by not notifying students, the public or its police department that university officials knew an alleged serial sex offender was on campus. When asked why, OSU officials cited FERPA confidentiality requirements.

Other nominees:

The city of South Bend, Ind., and Mayor Pete Buttigieg was nominated for refusing to release tapes of telephone conversations at the police department that reportedly contain "unethical, racial and possibly criminal content."

The Washington State Board of Accountancy was nominated for reportedly abusing the deliberative process disclosure exemption of the state's Public Records Act.

A fourth submission was disqualified by judges because the nominee was a newspaper. Private businesses, including newspapers, are not subject to open records or open government laws.

We had planned on releasing the name of the winner during Sunshine Week but our Black Hole Award chair Mike Farrell experienced serious health problems about that time, so we were unable to meet that deadline. We got the release out the following week instead.

PUBLIC INFORMATION OFFICER SURVEY

FOI Committee member Carolyn Carlson conducted a survey of more than 100 government public information officers, in conjunction with the National Association of Government Communicators. About 65 percent said they felt it necessary to supervise interviews of their agency's staff. We released the report for Sunshine Week.

QUILL COLUMNS

October: PIO—friend or foe? By Linda Petersen and Kathryn Foxhall

December: How's Your Sense of Skepticism? By Linda Petersen

February: Beware of Language Abuse by David Chartrand

Upcoming: Carolyn Carlson and Joey Senat are working on a column about the OSU situation.

PIO ISSUES

I am still a member of the Stop the New American censorship committee, which now has a website: snac.org. We are working with Sonny and other journalism organizations on a letter to send to President Obama and his administration, protesting the lock PIOs have on much government information and access.

SIGN ONS/LETTERS

We've signed on to several openthegovernment.org and other open government advocacy group letters this year. We've also written letters to the governor of Wyoming, protesting legislation that makes the identity of finalists for university president positions private, and a letter to Fox News reporter Jana Winter in support of her refusal to reveal the names of her sources in the James Holmes/Aurora, Colo. Theater shooting. We've also issued a statement in support of Ms. Winter.

NEW COMMITTEE MEMBERS

Joey Senat

Senat, an associate journalism professor at Oklahoma State University, writes a blog, foioklahoma.blogspot.com, for FOI Oklahoma Inc., a nonprofit representing a statewide coalition of open government advocates.

Senat has spoken on FOI, First Amendment and journalism education issues at dozens of professional and academic conferences, including the AEJMC National Conference, IRE National Conference, IRE Better Watchdog Workshops and SPJ Region 8 conferences. In summer 2012, he conducted open records training sessions across the Midwest for SPJ.

JENNIFER KARCHMER

Karchmer, a member of the Western Washington pro chapter, has more than 20 years of professional experience working in both MSM (CNN, Gannett, McClatchy, the AP), and local, independent outlets. Currently, she writes for Whatcom Watch, an independent community monthly based in Bellingham, publishing in print for more than 20 years (1992). She researches and writes about the journalism industry, specifically freedom of the press, First Amendment and constitutional issues.

UPCOMING CONVENTION CLASSES

“Working With PIOs” - Carolyn Carlson. At the suggestion of the planning committee, Joey Senat is putting together a session on “finding and utilizing government databases online.” The focus will be practical, skills-based training that is widely applicable.



MEMORANDUM

DATE: April 1, 2013
FROM: Michael Fitzgerald, Freelance Committee Chair
SUBJ: Freelance Committee report
FOR: SPJ Board of Directors

The SPJ Freelance Committee has continued to be active this year, serving as a resource to freelancers and freelancers-to-be around the country. The biggest addition we've made this year is the completion of an **insurance benefits option** for members, spurred by former chair Dana Neuts, who brought this to fruition after she had finished her term. Volunteers on our team continue to aim for weekly posts to the Independent Journalist blog, field questions and inquiries from SPJ members and nonmembers (our average has fallen off from inquiries about weekly to inquiries about monthly), write regular Freelance Toolbox columns for each issue of the *Quill* and post to Twitter via @SPJfreelance. We are beginning the process of updating our digital resource guide for freelance journalists.

Our Committee – Our committee consists of chair Michael Fitzgerald, vice chair Ruth E. Thaler-Carter, Crai Bower, Carol Cole-Frowe, Eric Francis, Dana Neuts, Paula Pant, Anna Pratt and David Sheets. We lost a couple of members in the last year, including Jeff Cutler, who stepped aside in favor of other SPJ work. We have looked to expand our membership geographically (our members live in metropolitan Atlanta, Boston, Minneapolis, St. Louis and Seattle, as well as Arkansas, Oklahoma and upstate New York). We are looking to increase our racial, ethnic and professional diversity (i.e., adding a non-text-based freelancer). We have had some conversations but not snared another volunteer.

Committee Responsibilities – We continue to discuss the best way for busy freelancers to volunteer their time to contribute. We would like to be more active on social media, but have been unable to get commitments to post regularly on Twitter, or to organize (or even attend) Twitter chats, something we are interested in doing. We have been able to schedule blog post, and keep up with Quill columns. There are tweets sent out from @SPJFreelance account on a semi-regular basis. [Twitter stats as of 4/1: 446 updates, following 483, followed by 482]. We are discussing whether it makes sense for SPJ to develop a freelance exchange or marketplace.

EIJ2013 – Our major focus so far this year has been to develop content ideas for the EIJ13 conference in Anaheim. We proposed an entire freelance track for the conference. The conference program committee demurred on a full track, but asked us to pick two of our suggestions and develop those into conference items. We are in the process of doing so. We would expect to have at the conference our committee meeting and to participate in a “doctor is in” roundtable discussion.

Freelance Resources – The Independent Journalist blog

(<http://blogs.spjnetwork.org/freelance/>) continues to be a significant part of our resource library, with a goal of posting at least weekly. Recent posts have looked at grammar, networking and those insurance benefits mentioned above. These will continue to be goals of the committee. Blog traffic (year-to-date) for 2013 is at 9,973 visits, above our quarterly average for 2012.

So far this year we have had 270 downloads of the **Digital Resource Guide** for freelancers focusing on journalism. Committee member David Sheets continues to lead this project. We are gearing up to update the guide. We'd also like to make it available as paid e-book for non-members.

What's next? We are working towards EIJ13, and getting our social media legs under us. We are talking about how to develop a more powerful freelance marketplace through the SPJ site.

Summary

We are still transitioning away from the excellent leadership of Dana Neuts, under which the committee achieved several ambitious projects. We are making some progress on new projects, thanks to the dedication of our volunteer members.



MEMORANDUM

DATE: April 2, 2013
FROM: Lynn Walsh, Generation J Committee Chair
SUBJ: Generation J Committee report
FOR: SPJ Board of Directors

About: Generation J is an SPJ committee where future newsroom leaders can collaborate to build newsrooms of the future. We offer an opportunity for early-career journalists to give or get career advice, share and obtain industry insight, pick up new skills and tools and stay on top of the issues that affect journalists and newsrooms every day. The Society of Professional Journalists and the Generation J committee inspire journalists to improve and protect journalism.

Who: Eleven journalists based in cities throughout the country sit on the committee writing for the blog, maintaining social media accounts and participating in a variety of outreach activities. The committee is chaired by Lynn Walsh an investigative journalist based in West Palm Beach, Florida. The other committee members are: Jennifer Sullivan, Mike Brannen, Jackie Ingles, Claudia Amezcua, Victoria Reitano, Andrew Seaman, Patrick Kane, Ryan Broussard and Robert McLean.

What: SPJ Generation J is working toward its mission by participating and leading the following programs:

Excellence in Journalism 2012/2013 Conferences: Members of the Generation J committee worked together with SPJ headquarters to have an increased presences at the convention in 2012 and think the response of our programming was positive. We were critiquing resume during the 2012 convention in Fort Lauderdale. We worked and presented more than five different sessions, four of which will occur on the same day, allowing for a “Generation J” day where we presented sessions that are targeted to our committee demographic while creating an atmosphere that allows for conversations and personal communication. We also hosted a #GenJ meetup at local restaurants and bars near the hotel. With help from the SPJ South Florida chapter, we were able to pick locations and will be tweeting live from the event with the hashtag #GenJ. We also passed out buttons and ribbons to people who fit the Gen J demographic so people can better identify who may be their peers in the industry.

We are still working with headquarters on plans for 2013. Nothing is set in stone yet, but we have submitted program ideas and are waiting to hear back from the committee to see if they have been chosen. We hope that we will be able to be involved as much if not more than last year.

SPJ Mentor Match-Up. The Mentor Match-up is still going strong. The program transitioned from a traditional mentor program with veteran journalists and early-career journalists to one that is community based using Facebook. The group is private and only SPJ members can join. Every few months there are new mentors that join and provide advice and answers to questions from anyone in the group. The great thing about the Facebook group is that people can respond when they want and on their time. The group also allows for discussions about industry trends, journalism ethics and more in a private and safe environment. As of April 1, 2013 there were 85 members in the group. Headquarters has asked us to change the name of the program -- we are working on that with them.

First Draft Blog. Committee members take turns creating posts for the blog that is part of the SPJ blog network. Contributions range from industry insight from committee member to tips on creating better coverage in a news organization. We have been working on shorter posts that focus on fast, easy tips to help journalists. These “Five Things” posts have been publishing on Fridays since February of this year. In August 2012 we launched a “Why I love my Job” series where committee members shared personal experiences about why they love their job. One of the posts was even picked up by Media Bistro and featured in their daily newsletter.

Social Media. Generation J has a presence on Facebook, Twitter, Pinterest, Google+, Tumblr and LinkedIn. All committee members work together to update and keep the accounts fresh with new links and information. The committee has discussed being more active on Twitter by participating in various Twitter chats like the SPJ chats on Thursday. The committee has also created two hashtags: #GenJ and #TuesdayTips. #GenJ is used by members and others when articles or tweets are posted that relate to Gen J members. #TuesdayTips has just started and is an opportunity for us to share quick tips with fellow journalists. Once a month the committee holds Google+ hangouts and Twitter Chats for Gen J members. The committee worked with Muck Rack to hold a joint Twitter chat about plagiarism in journalism. We picked up a lot of followers and were able to begin the conversation. We are hoping to do more partnerships like this one in the future. These are an opportunity to vent about work, share insight into the journalism industry or just chat about news.

CMA 2013 NYC Conference. Andrew Seaman and Victoria Reitano attended the 2013 College Media Advisers convention in New York City in March. The committee saw the conference as an opportunity for SPJ and Generation J to reach current college students before they graduate. The conference is an amazing outreach opportunity for Generation J to reach out to future Gen Jers and potential SPJ members. It was an opportunity to raise awareness about the committee and SPJ while helping future newsroom leaders. Victoria and Andrew presented sessions to the college students, including one on the importance of personal branding, what it is like in your first job and 50 website you must know about.

Future plans: Along with continuing to develop the SPJ Mentor Match-Up program and the First Draft blog, the committee has discussed other possible programs/areas of focus for next year:

Outreach to young journalists: Generation J committee members feel there is a strong need to reach out to young journalists before they graduate. The Gen J committee feels that this lack of

knowledge can lead to lower membership for SPJ now and in the future. The committee feels SPJ has a lot to offer journalists, especially young journalists, and we want to help spread the word about the organization as a whole and our committee. To do this, we want to be able to attend more conferences and do more targeted outreach at events and meetings where a target demographic is present. Several members are participating in the SPJ regional conferences where they are presenting sessions and helping organize the conferences for SPJ.



MEMORANDUM

DATE: March 21, 2013
FROM: Deb Wenger and Jeff Cutler, Professional Development Committee Co-Chairs
SUBJ: Professional Development Committee report
FOR: SPJ Board of Directors

The committee's primary efforts are focused on three areas of professional development and training: on-site training through the SPJ Journalism Training Program, eCampus videos and webinars.

In the past year we have been involved in the following:

1. **Creating a series of live and recorded webinars.** Committee members have produced two sessions, including one on mobile newsgathering and one on data visualization. Each had about 70 participants and both are expected to generate additional views online. Our goal is to identify a third topic to present before the convention in August.
2. **eCampus expansion.** In the past year, the committee has helped facilitate three more topics for the eCampus training effort: personal branding, mobile newsgathering and data visualization. We sent out an email to educator members, reminding them of the video offerings and encouraging them to incorporate the videos into class presentations.
3. **Expanding and promoting the Newsroom Training Program.** This successful program has been around since 2004, and has expanded several times since the first set of modules was developed. With the data visualization module in production, we will soon offer 14 customizable training topics.

In consultation with HQ, we are now specifically targeting journalism educators with the program. Our goal is get to three campuses in the coming year as part of a pilot program. We have received four inquiries within two days of an email blast to our educator members, so we believe there will be sufficient interest. This focus on educator members was one of our goals for last year, so we appreciate the support for this initiative.

In addition, Wenger wrote a piece for Quill about the ways in which mobile newsgathering is changing the industry. It also focused on new training opportunities for members.

As always, we're open to ideas on how to improve the professional development opportunities for our members!